

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XVII

APRIL, 1932

No. 2

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

KEEPING THE FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST

Harold Paul Sloan

THE LEVITICAL OFFERINGS

J. Russell Horoden

REFORMATION OR REVOLUTION

H. M. DuBose

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN HISTORY

R. Birch Hoyle

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

H. E. Dana

EXEGETICAL

Divine Destiny and Human Failure

Andrew R. Osborn

"Now the God of Peace . . . Make You Perfect"

Howard T. Kuist

THE REVIEW

Trends of Theological Thought

Current Thought and Activity. Books

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

Published by
THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY IN NEW YORK

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

INTERDENOMINATIONAL — QUARTERLY

PUBLISHED BY

THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY IN NEW YORK

WILBERT W. WHITE, *President*

ROBERT M. KURTZ, *Editor*

Associate Editors:

WILBERT W. WHITE

ANDREW R. OSBORN

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF

PUBLICATION OFFICE, 36 BEAVER STREET, ALBANY, NEW YORK

EDITORIAL AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE, 235 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Σπουδασον σεαυτὸν δόκιμον παραστήσαι τῷ Θεῷ, ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον,
ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας.—2 Timothy 2:15.

Vol. XVII

APRIL, 1932

No. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
EDITORIAL	165
KEEPING THE FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST	
HAROLD PAUL SLOAN	171
THE LEVITICAL OFFERINGS. J. RUSSELL HOWDEN	185
REFORMATION OR REVOLUTION. H. M. DuBOSE	199
THE LORD'S PRAYER IN HISTORY. R. BIRCH HOYLE	210
THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE	
H. E. DANA	227
EXEGETICAL	
DIVINE DESTINY AND HUMAN FAILURE. ANDREW R. OSBORN	244
"NOW THE GOD OF PEACE . . . MAKE YOU PERFECT"	
HOWARD T. KUIST	249
THE REVIEW. TRENDS OF THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT. CURRENT	
THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY. BOOKS	254

THE PRICE OF THE BIBLICAL REVIEW IS TWO DOLLARS a year, prepaid in American territory, in Canada, Mexico, and Samoa. For all other countries, add thirty cents postage. Single copies, fifty cents. *REMITTANCES* should be payable to *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW*. Receipt of subscription is included with subscriber's address on each copy. *CHANGE OF ADDRESS.* For change, give both old and new addresses. *SUBSCRIPTIONS* should be sent to the Publication Office, 36 Beaver Street, P. O. Box 495, Albany, N. Y., or the Executive Office, 235 East 49th Street, New York, N. Y., as indicated above.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Albany, New York, October 14, 1920, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized.

Copyright 1932, by The Biblical Seminary in New York.

THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY IN NEW YORK

WILBERT W. WHITE, *President*

THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY was founded in 1900 by Dr. Wilbert W. White, for the purpose of providing such training for Christian leaders as should combine the highest educational and theological attainments with a thorough and comprehensive mastery of the English Bible.

On May 21, 1903, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, Albany, New York, granted a limited charter to the institution, then known as the Bible Teachers Training School. An amendment to the charter, granted on July 1, 1916, gave the School the right to recommend graduates for suitable degrees.

Department of Theology. On February 20, 1920, courses in the DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY, leading to the degrees of *Bachelor of Sacred Theology*, *Master of Sacred Theology*, and *Doctor of Sacred Theology*, were registered by the Board of Regents.

By action of the Board of Regents on September 22, 1921, the name was changed from the Bible Teachers Training School to The Biblical Seminary in New York.

Department of Religious Education. On April 17, 1928, the courses in this Department were registered by the State Department of Education, making it possible for The Biblical Seminary to recommend students for the degrees of *Bachelor of Religious Education*, *Master of Religious Education*, and *Doctor of Religious Education*.

On May 15, 1930, the Board of Regents formally voted that the provisional charter be changed to an absolute charter. This action gives power to The Biblical Seminary to confer its own degrees in Theology and Religious Education.

In addition the Seminary conducts a DEPARTMENT OF MISSIONS and a DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE.

During the past thirty years there have been about 5500 students enrolled in the various departments of The Biblical Seminary. Former students are now working in all parts of the world as ministers, educational leaders, evangelists, missionaries, college and seminary professors, teachers in high schools and in schools of Religious Education, and in other lines of Christian service.

Write for *Catalogue*, addressing

DR. WALTER E. BACHMAN, Dean
235 East 49th Street New York, N. Y.

WHY FOR THE PASTOR?

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW is exceptionally well adapted to the needs of the minister who cannot do all the reading he feels his work requires.

Because it is published to keep ministers and other leaders in touch with the best Christian thought and activity.

Because it avoids extremes, being neither disloyal to our Lord and the Scriptures, nor intolerant toward those whom it cannot follow on nonessential points.

Because it carries an elaborate review of current religious literature, seeking to keep its readers informed upon the most important articles and books.

Because it has a commanding list of contributors, such as:

PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, Berlin.
DR. PAUL W. HARRISON, Medical Missionary to Arabia.
BISHOP H. M. DU BOSE, Methodist Episcopal Church, South.
DR. S. D. CHOWN, Toronto, Can.
REV. ALBERT D. BELDEN, Superintendent Whitefield's Tabernacle, London.
PROFESSOR ANDREW R. OSBORN, The Biblical Seminary in New York.
DR. CHARLES R. ERDMAN, Princeton Theological Seminary.
REV. J. RUSSELL HOWDEN, England.
DR. ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF, Specialist in Religious Psychology.
PROFESSOR GEERHARDUS VOS, Princeton Theological Seminary.
PROFESSOR J. G. MCKENZIE, Paton College, England.
PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
PROFESSOR ALVA J. MCCLAIN, The Brethren Church.
E. K. SIMPSON, Ipswich, England.
PROFESSOR GEORGE STIBITZ, Central Theological Seminary.
MR. P. WHITWELL WILSON, Journalist, Author *The Christ We Forget*.
DR. HARMON H. MCQUILKIN, Presbyterian Pastor, Orange, N. J.
DR. ALFREDO TAGLIALATELA, Prominent Italian Protestant Leader.
DR. H. W. McLAUGHLIN, Southern Presbyterian Director Country Church.
W. BELL DAWSON, Distinguished Scientist, Montreal, Can.
PROFESSOR A. G. HOGG, Madras College, India.
REV. R. BIRCH HOYLE, Baptist Pastor, Writer, England.
DR. HENRY CHAPMAN SWEARINGEN, St. Paul, Minn.
DR. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN.
DR. ARTHUR J. BROWN, Foreign Board, Presbyterian Church in U. S. A.
DR. W. GRAHAM SCROGGIE, Edinburgh, Scotland.
BISHOP W. F. OLDHAM, Methodist Episcopal Church.
W. H. T. DAU, President emeritus, Valparaiso University.
PROFESSOR DAVID S. CAIRNS, United Free Church College, Aberdeen.
DR. ROBERT E. SPEER, Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.
PRINCIPAL JOHN McNICOL, Toronto Bible College.
DR. ANDREW GILLIES, Rochester, N. Y.
PROFESSOR WALTER L. LINGLE, Union Theological Seminary (Richmond).
DR. CHARLES L. GOODELL, Federal Council of Churches.
E. G. SIHLER, Professor emeritus, New York University.
REV. T. H. WRIGHT, Scots Church, Paris, Art and Literary Critic.
DR. LOUIS M. SWEET, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago.
PRINCIPAL A. McCAIG, Spurgeon's College, London.

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

All man's life he has been haunted by the infinite, and yet he cannot grasp the infinite, he cannot think the infinite. Paganism clothed its infinite with finite symbols that it might appropriate Him. Every idol of the centuries is a dumb expression of man's eagerness for the Incarnation. One may indeed deny that there has been an Incarnation, but one cannot deny that the idea of God in flesh is the fulfilment of all those buffeted, struggling aspirations of man's soul across the mounting centuries.

—DR. HAROLD PAUL SLOAN
in this issue.

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XVII

APRIL, 1932

No. 2

EDITORIAL

ONE OF THE MOST TROUBLESOME WORDS WE HAVE TODAY, at least so far as the church is concerned, is the single syllable, creed. It symbolizes something that is a continual source of disagreement. If, on the one hand, we refuse to employ any brief expression of our faith, we labor under the disadvantage of rendering that faith inarticulate, so far as a concise and easily understood statement of its essentials goes.

But, on the other hand, when we seek to devise such a brief setting forth of what gives Christianity its transcendent importance, we soon discover that there are differences over the items of faith to be included and even over their interpretation.

Writing upon *Keeping the Faith of Jesus Christ*, Dr. Sloan, in his usual clear and forthright style, takes up this very question of the "synopsis of the Christian faith." Basing his observations on certain of Paul's words to Timothy, he proceeds to show the genesis of the credal principle, whether in religion or science, beginning with the bearing of the laws of man's consciousness on the matter and with the "primary values" of "reason, freedom, duty, and the infinite."

However, his article is not chiefly concerned with the philosophy of creed or no creed, and so he passes on to consider the logical ground and necessity of the center of

the Christian message, belief in Jesus Christ. To the honest and intelligent seeker after guidance it is made plain that the Gospel is not dealing with possibilities, probabilities or advisabilities, touching the idea of Christ, but with inescapable logical necessities. Further, the significance of Paul's expression, "the pattern of sound words," the simple putting of the faith, becomes evident. The practical value of this "pattern" in propagating the faith and in helping the believer to hold it emerges as the argument proceeds, and the preacher will find here valuable points for presenting both the reasonableness and the necessity of faith in Jesus Christ.

THERE ARE GREAT SPRINGS OF SPIRITUAL TRUTH AND life in the Old Testament. It is a serious error for anyone to yield to the vague idea that this body of Scripture has served its spiritual purpose completely and is of interest chiefly as a mine of historical sources. The very beginnings of the redemptive work of God for the race are revealed there, to find their full completion in the New Testament. Indeed the earlier development of this plan is the central theme of the Old Testament, and the Levitical code contains a ceremonial foreshowing of it adapted to that time and to that stage in the progress of mankind. Hence it is abundantly worth while to look into its meanings. We have in Mr. Howden's paper, *The Levitical Offerings*, a brief but excellent aid for studying this subject. He first points out the two chief answers to Job's question, "How should a man be just with God?" the one being found in the Levitical code, the other in the prophets. It is the one involved in the Levitical code that is here considered.

It is needless to anticipate Mr. Howden's argument here. Suffice it to say that he considers pardon from the

standpoint of the very necessities implied in the unapproachable holiness of God—a fundamental principle strangely overlooked in much modern preaching and teaching. The whole subject of the nature of sin and the conditions upon which it can be pardoned demands the first attention of the pulpit, since it is the central theme of Christianity; yet, in an age so peculiarly in need of it, lesser things receive the chief emphasis. Here is an argument that should at least help to bring us out upon the main road again.

IF THERE HAS BEEN ANY DISPOSITION TO PLAY WITH present religious and social problems as though they were mere subjects for debate, that attitude has passed. It is being borne in upon men that changes of the first magnitude are impending. Are our social and economic structures going to survive the collision of forces that have long been gathering? What part is religion going to have in the struggle, and, more specifically, will the church have a place of importance, especially of decisive importance? It is beyond doubt a time for facing the facts. Human history seems to be reaching one of its great turning points, and Christianity, or the lack of it, will be a deciding factor.

In his brief article, *Reformation or Revolution*, Bishop Du Bose seeks to place the situation in its historical perspective and to point out, and make some appraisal of, the main forces at work. When a man of his decidedly scholarly tastes turns aside from more congenial pursuits to sound the warning trumpet to the church and to society he must feel that there is sufficient reason.

It is shown what great changes for the better followed the Reformation, but that the tremendous spirit-

ual and moral forces then brought to bear upon society have lost much or most of their momentum. At the same time adverse theological, philosophical, and ethical influences have been developing to such an extent that there must soon be something in our day to correspond to the Reformation or we shall be in the throes of revolution before we realize it.

This paper is a summons to serious thought, and it indicates the fields where study and thought and courage and prayer and preaching are desperately needed if the church is to be faithful to her Lord and is to fulfill her duty to men in the days ahead.

FEW PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE HAVE BEEN THE SUBJECTS of more study and more expository writing than has the Lord's Prayer. Some of the expressions in that brief utterance have been debated throughout Christian history. It has been regarded as the most beautiful of all prayers; yet there are devout Christians who doubt whether it can be properly used as a representative Christian prayer. The reason for their uncertainty is that, since Christ's atoning work was not finished when He taught this prayer, it was not offered in His Name, as He later enjoined His followers to pray.

For this and other reasons it is eminently fitting that we consider its place in Christian history and its interpretation by church leaders throughout the ages. In the present issue of this quarterly Mr. Hoyle, already well known to our readers and an associate editor of *The British Weekly*, writes upon *The Lord's Prayer in History*. He finds the subject too large to be covered fully in one paper, and so considers chiefly the understanding of the prayer by the early Fathers and its use by the church of their day.

After his general introduction Mr. Hoyle devotes attention, first, to the forms of the Lord's Prayer, as found in Matthew and Luke as well as elsewhere. Then follows an illuminating section upon the comments of the early Fathers. One important principle brought out here deserves particular attention, as it is widely overlooked in these days. That is the early recognition of the fact that only those redeemed by Christ have the right to call God our Father.

However men differed in their understanding of details, it is very evident that this great prayer had no insignificant place in the spiritual life and the worship of the early Christians; hence it cannot be overlooked or slighted in any study of the history of the beginnings of Christianity.

THAT THE BIBLE IS DIVINELY INSPIRED IS THE ESSENTIAL, underlying fact that gives us faith in its message. Yet, notwithstanding its inspiration, its most loyal students are not agreed as to its interpretation on this point or that.

There is a progressive understanding of religious as well as other truth, and moreover, since some minds are able to advance further than others, the stages reached in this progress often mark differing classes of believers. It is most unfortunate that serious misunderstandings, even antagonisms, develop between persons and groups who represent, not different beliefs, so much as varying degrees of comprehension. One reason for such variant views is that some people are more literally minded than others.

Now, the treatment in the New Testament of passages quoted from the Old have been a source of persistent difficulty for expositors, and contain possibilities of

serious differences. On this point Dr. Dana's paper, *The Old Testament in the Apostolic Age*, renders us a service, putting the whole question in such a way that some apparently serious discrepancies become negligible or of only minor importance.

After touching briefly upon the difference between our Lord's use of the Old Testament (which he treated at length in this quarterly in July, 1931) and its use by those of the apostolic age, he deals with four "determining factors" that guided the apostolic expositors. He also calls attention to the fact that the writers of the New Testament accepted the traditional method of dealing with an Old Testament passage, since this was best suited to their purpose of proclaiming the Christian message. Considerable attention is devoted to the question of adapted quotations from the Old Testament, something hardly to be tolerated today, but quite in order then.

IN THE EXEGETICAL DEPARTMENT OF THIS NUMBER Professor Osborn devotes his space to a study of Isaiah 2, under the title, *Divine Destiny and Human Failure*. This is not an appeal to individual responsibility so much as to national, and it is very appropriate at this time.

Dr. Kuist gives an unusually valuable word study, based on Hebrews 13:21, "*Now the God of Peace . . . Make You Perfect.*" The Greek word here rendered "perfect" is shown to have a rich content.

ALL THE BOOKS REVIEWED IN THIS ISSUE DEAL WITH SUBJECTS of importance in the religious world. They include:

The Word and the World.—Brunner.

India's Religion of Grace and Christianity.—Otto.

Science & Religion.—A symposium.

The Discovery of God.—Snowden.

The Psychology of a Primitive People.—Porteus.

Mary Baker Eddy.—Powell.

R. M. K.

KEEPING THE FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST

By HAROLD PAUL SLOAN

IN SECOND TIMOTHY, the first chapter, verses thirteen and fourteen, there is a very interesting primitive Christian record:

Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.

That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.

The "pattern of sound words" is really a primitive creed or synopsis of the Christian faith. The "good thing which was committed unto thee" is the precious deposit or sacred trust, the Gospel itself. Rerendering this passage, it would run:

'Hold fast the reliable synopsis of the Gospel which, in the faith and love of Jesus Christ, you received from me. Guard the precious trust through the Holy Spirit which dwells in us.'

There was then in the primitive church a formula of faith, outlining the Gospel. The probability is there were several of these formulae. One seems to be preserved in 1 Corinthians 15:3, where St. Paul speaks of delivering to the church that which first of all he had received, "that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures," etc. There is another one in 1 Timothy 3:16, where the Apostle speaks of the mystery of godliness, "God manifest in the flesh," etc. Irenaeus and Tertullian both tell us that there was such a synopsis of the Christian faith which came down to their day from apostolic times.

It is entirely possible that this primitive formula may be preserved to us in the familiar Apostles' Creed. Irenaeus and Tertullian, who were familiar with that original creed and both of whom, in fact, wrote a synopsis of faith for their churches, closely paralleled it in their own putting of the faith. The earliest Latin form of the Apostles' Creed and the creed of Irenaeus and Tertullian were all three Trinitarian in form, and practically identical in substance. One cannot read the three without wondering whether the so-called Apostles' Creed was not in fact a sort of standard or norm after which other creeds were modeled, and if it was not an expansion of the baptismal formula preserved in Matthew 28:18-20, a creed developed in apostolic times from the very words of Jesus. These things may not be certain, but they are at least an interesting possibility. However, it is a certainty that there was a synopsis of faith in circulation in St. Paul's day which he regarded as of very high value and which he exhorted Timothy to guard with earnest devotion.

Christianity then was from the beginning definitely credal. It sought to lift life, not by an ethical appeal alone, but also, and more fundamentally, by enlarging the horizon of man's life through faith. This credal point of view is in our day considerably in disrepute. We are constantly being told the day of creeds is past and that the advance of knowledge has left creeds behind. This point of view is, however, both superficial and uninformed, for the fact of the matter is, creeds are universal; and the credal element is as abundant in the modern empirical sciences as ever it was in either philosophy or religion.

Everyone knows that science is constantly changing. One fears, however, that few have stopped to realize that

among these changes are repeatedly included major scientific doctrines which had long been held as established facts, and which had been distinctly creative in the scientific thinking of the preceding decades or century. Take a few examples.

Physicists following Newton invented the hypothetical ether. It was in general acceptance for more than a century, and it was a most influential idea. Recently it has been abandoned and is now almost universally repudiated.

Again, LaPlace gave to science the nebular hypothesis near the opening of the nineteenth century. This hypothesis has been almost universally fundamental in scientific thinking during the past hundred years. Since the opening of the twentieth century it has been almost universally abandoned. It was succeeded at first by the planetismal theory, and more recently by the tidal theory.

Before the time of Charles Darwin, LaMarc suggested evolution by adjustment to environment and the inheritance of acquired characteristics. Ernst Haeckel called the latter of these propositions "that axiom of science." The principle of the inheritance of acquired characteristics was of course fundamental to Darwinism. Mendel's experiments, which were at first discounted, have made this idea almost if not quite untenable.

The spontaneous origin of life from non-organic matter was universally accepted in scientific circles until Pasteur at the middle of the nineteenth century. Some dogmatic evolutionists still assert it, notwithstanding that all the facts are against it; but the idea is generally repudiated by the best science of today.

Professor Bateson frankly admits that evolution has

not been inductively established; that it is, in fact, a creed, an idea held by faith. Since the collapse of Darwinism the idea seems to be incapable of exact definition. It is evidently no longer even a precise scientific hypothesis. It is simply a creed, and a vague and uncertain one at that.

The credal element is thus extensively manifest in the natural sciences. The fact is, the advance of science has in no way effected the necessity for creeds. Creeds are universal. Men have always had them, and always will have them. They are a necessity of all comprehensive and fundamental thinking. The explanation of this fact is apparent. Man's consciousness reveals two widely different sets of experiences. He first of all has his contacts with the objective universe through his senses. These contacts are vivid, convincing, compelling; but they are nevertheless mediate and therefore less reliable than those other experiences which we want now to mention. This second group of experiences can best be described as in a general way inward and immediate, as contrasted with the former group which were outward and mediate through the senses. These immediate experiences of man's consciousness are less vivid and convincing than his sense experiences, and the realities they disclose are also markedly different. The world of sense experience is constantly limited and finite. The realities disclosed in man's immediate consciousness are infinite, free, transcendent.

Here then is the rise of the creed: A man can, first, hold to the truth of his total consciousness; or he can, second, bound it by that which is revealed in sense experience alone. If a man, believing in the total revelation of his consciousness, affirms the reality of the infinite and transcendent and free he has a supernaturalistic or reli-

gious creed. But if, on the contrary, he should reject all that which transcends sense experience his creed would be naturalistic, or atheistic. It is important, however, to note that the second position is just as much a credal position as the first. The fact of the matter is, reason is upon the side of religion. It is a serious tax upon one's intellectual faculties to demand that the finite world of sense experience be regarded as self-sufficient and self-explanatory. Man's natural point of view inevitably seeks the explanation of the finite in the infinite.

Any man who would undertake fundamental thinking must first of all make choice of his basis. He can choose to start with the world of sense experience, putting a question mark over against the immediate inward experiences of consciousness; then, as a result, his creed, which he often misnames science or philosophy, will be mechanistic. On the contrary, he can start by assuming the truth of the total reality revealed in consciousness, giving priority to his immediate rather than to his mediate experiences, and the result will be that his creed will be Theistic and Christian.

It is my deep conviction that we have been giving too much attention to the truths of sense experience, and that if we are to arrive at truth there must be a new emphasis upon the sublime values disclosed in man's immediate consciousness. Mathematics and all the principles of thought are intuitive. They are certainties of man's immediate consciousness; they are not inductively derived. They are the fundamental rationality which makes it possible for him to think at all. His sense of personal freedom, of being responsibly creative, is similarly intuitive. He knows it immediately. So also is his sense of moral obligation. The details of duty are of course largely filled in by social experiences, but the

original sense of obligation is not acquired; it is an immediate consciousness. All have an intuitive sense of social solidarity and of obligation within that solidarity. So, too, the infinite and transcendent is intuitive. Space and time as we actually apprehend them are limited, finite values, but space and time as our souls experience them are infinite and unlimited. Our minds cannot come to rest in the finite. We feel it to be encompassed by a surrounding infinite, and this sense is immediate and unescapable. Doubtless this inner world of the soul is vague and indefinite, but it is nevertheless immediate and universal, and in comparison with the world of sense experience it is undeniably the more certain of the two.

The behavioristic or mechanistic thinker, who seeks to explain the inner world as a phenomenon of the outer, is simply a victim of muddled thinking; for if the inner world is not accepted we have no contact with the outer whatsoever. If man is not a free, transcendent intellect and will, as he feels himself to be, then his thinking as well as his conduct is fate, and truth is done. In a mechanistic world man must turn out unescapable opinions, as the kaleidoscope turns out its changing figures. Fate makes John Watson a Behaviorist, and fate makes Professor McDougal a believer in moral personality. The order of the universe thus decrees contradictory opinions. Watson cannot help his behaviorism; Darwin cannot help his evolution; Einstein cannot help his relativity. The collocation of atoms has produced each of these opinions. Science is fate; truth is done.

The fundamental necessity of thought is to insist upon the reality and reliability of those values that are revealed in man's immediate consciousness. This is the start, and the only start, that can lead to any satisfying conclusion. Electrons and natural law are inferences.

The primary values are reason, freedom, duty, and the infinite. Starting, then, with these values of man's immediate inner consciousness, there are instantly three consequences.

First of all, we are in a position summarily to dismiss any speculative point of view, such as Watson's behaviorism or Dewey's determinism or Haeckel's materialism, because these opinions do violence to man's free moral reason, which is our only instrument of knowledge. The total content of man's immediate consciousness must be assumed, or thinking becomes impossible.

Second, if we start with these values revealed immediately in our consciousness, then the transcendent, the supernatural, if we may so speak, becomes a part of the very order of nature; for man's free creative spirit, acting upon his body and ordering it, is as much an invasion of the natural order of purely physical causation as were the miracles of Jesus. Let us have no uncertainty here; once we have admitted human freedom, the transcendence of man's spirit to the closed causation of nature at any point whatsoever, the philosophy of naturalism, with its hostility to miracles, must be given up. If man's spirit is free, creative, transcendent to the order of nature, then the supernatural is included within the natural order. If man's free spirit can start a physical excitation in his brain which moves his hand and so acts upon the law-abiding universe, the principle of the supernatural has been admitted. That act by which man's transcendent spirit moves the tissue of his brain and starts an excitation which lifts his hand or builds a bridge is as supernatural to nature's closed causation as Jesus' walking on the water.

The third consequence of starting thus with our own

immediate experience in our effort to explain the universe is, that the supernatural Christ of the Christian creed becomes no longer a stranger, foreign to our life, but is seen instead as the very superlative of truth, the fulfilment of man's soul.

There are those who may question the historic reality of the Jesus of the New Testament, but no man who knows the passion and outreach of his own soul can deny that Jesus' stately figure is the answer and fulfilment to everything that is best and noblest in himself. We grope for truth and lose our way. We invent hypotheses that break our hearts, and then deny them after we have seen their dreadful fruitage. Jesus knew the truth and spoke it with a quiet certainty that was free from doubt.

We aspire for ideals, we hunger and thirst after righteousness, our noblest souls are the most conscious of their failure; but Jesus saw Himself as the image and expression of holy Deity. We are limited by the forces of nature about us. We feel ourselves like a moth in the flame, we are buffeted and driven; Jesus was the sovereign of nature, the master of its powers. He spoke to wind and wave, to life and death, and they obeyed Him.

We long for life, but live ever shadowed by the grave. Still thirsting we fall, and silence covers us. We seem but waste engulfed in the deeps; but Jesus bursts His grave and lives again. He triumphs over death and realizes immortal life. This is Jesus; and whether or no He be true, He is undeniably the fulfilment of all man's age long passion and quest. He is the ideal, His is the sovereignty and immortality for which we long.

And then, too, in Him, God has come within our comprehension. He is, as Browning finely put it, the "weakness in strength that I cry for." All man's life he

has been haunted by the infinite, and yet he cannot grasp the infinite, he cannot think the infinite. Paganism clothed its infinite with finite symbols that it might appropriate Him. Every idol of the centuries is a dumb expression of man's eagerness for the Incarnation. One may indeed deny that there has been an Incarnation, but one cannot deny that the idea of God in flesh is the fulfilment of all those buffeted, struggling aspirations of man's soul across the mounting centuries.

Yes, it is so. Whether or not Jesus Christ be true, He is the truth. He is the fulfilment of man, the answer to his inner life. He is man's home. But let us get it clearly. The Christ who is these things is not the reduced Christ of naturalistic speculation. The naturalistic Christ is nothing. He is an unhistorical figure, whom Arthur Drews did well to abolish. He is at once contradictory, impossible, and useless. If we conceive Him our size, a man and only a man, then we cannot explain His absolute uniqueness. If we insist on His uniqueness, but deny His Deity, then we make Him a meaningless sport of nature. Being only a man and not God, He cannot save us. Being greater than a man, He cannot inspire us. Such a Christ is, as we have already said, both unhistorical and useless. The Christ who fulfills the soul of humanity is the Christ foretold by the prophets, God the eternal Son incarnate in the womb of Mary the virgin by the creative power of the Holy Ghost; the gift of the Triune God to men for their salvation; crucified for sin, triumphant over death, risen, ascended, the Head and Mediator of the new race; uniting the creature to the Creator, and thus completing the cycle of creation by binding the whole vast frame of things into the unity of the Triune God. This is the Christ of man's soul, the

Christ who fulfills man's soul, the Christ of the New Testament, the

Weakness in strength that I cry for, my flesh that I seek
In the Godhead. I seek and I find it, O Saul it shall be
A face like my face that receives thee, a man like to me
Thou shalt love and be loved by forever, a hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee. See the Christ
stand.

Starting then with myself, my free creative moral personality, rather than with uncertainly known electrons, let us approach the Biblical witness to Christ. We are Theists. We believe in the integrity and freedom of our own personalities. We are not muddled Pantheists, who out of devotion to a speculative naturalism deny the integrity of our being when we would explain it, and then reversing ourselves affirm its integrity when we want as free intellects to believe the explanation we have proposed. We are Theists. We believe in the integrity of our own free creative wills. We see ourselves in our physical being as a part of the natural order, but we see our spirit mind as transcendent to the natural order, made in the image of the infinite Mind and Will who created us. We are Theists. We believe in ourselves and in the Infinite which is behind ourselves.

As Theists, then let us turn to the Christian witness to Jesus. It is a century long movement brought to its climax during the fulness of the Greco-Roman civilization. Its theater was Jerusalem and Palestine, a section of country lying at the crossroads of the world, midway between Alexandria and Antioch, the second and third cities of the Empire, and but 350 miles from each. Jesus thus lived and died and rose again in the stream and near the center of the Greco-Roman world.

The crucial fact in the whole Christian witness is the

evidence of our Lord's resurrection from the dead. If this sublime event can be substantiated every other supernatural of the record will readily fall in line behind it; but if, on the contrary, the evidence for this event is wanting, every other supernatural event must fall with it. If Jesus did not rise from the dead, Israel's prophetic hope is left unfulfilled. If Jesus did not rise from the dead, the Christian church becomes an unexplained problem for history. If Jesus did not rise from the dead the human race is thrown back into the cheerless darkness of two thousand years ago, when Stoics steeled their hearts against the worst, and Epicureans laughed and forgot.

But the Christian witness to the resurrection of Jesus Christ is a powerful body of truth. Bishop Charles Gore said of it, in substance, that the witness of the apostles to Jesus' resurrection from the dead is so compelling that only such an invincible hostility to the supernatural as would refuse any array of evidence whatsoever could possibly explain one's failure to be convinced. Frank Morison holds the same opinion, and his conclusion is the more significant because he began his study of the evidences of this event with a firm prejudice against them. He had regarded all miracles as legendary and untrue; but when, notwithstanding his prejudice, he at last made a study of the New Testament records, he was so impressed that he reversed his basic attitude. He accepted the truth of the supernatural and concluded that the apostolic witness to the Resurrection was nothing less than the testimony of sober earnest men and women to a tremendous and meaningful fact.

This conclusion of Frank Morison, which he presents so forcefully in his volume, *Who Moved the Stone?* is reminiscent of a similar one which occurred nearly

two hundred years ago. Deistic philosophy was dominant in England, and Sir Gilbert West and Lord George Littleton decided to undertake a disproof of the supernatural, the one by a critical study of the record of Jesus' resurrection, and the other by a similar examination of the account of St. Paul's conversion given in the Acts. Each investigator as a result was forced to give up his unbelief. Both wrote volumes of Christian evidences. West produced *Observations on the Resurrection*, and Littleton, *Dissertations on the Conversion of St. Paul*.

The New Testament Gospel is not a cunningly devised fable. It is a stupendous body of truth; and all it needs is a fair chance and an unprejudiced mind to be seen as most convincing and compelling. Once a man can be persuaded to give up the unfounded and also impossible dogma of naturalism, the belief that nature is a closed system of forces, then the death-conquering Christ, God incarnate for man's redemption, will be seen so sublimely true, so supremely probable, as inevitably to be stood the noblest value in the ages. The tragedy of the twentieth century is that our soul-dishonoring creed of naturalism is cutting us off both from a worthy conception of ourselves and also from belief in the Saviour, Jesus Messiah our Lord.

Recent developments in science, however, give promise of leading us out of this darkness. The new physics has reduced the electron to a pulsation in empty space, and has thus made the universe the idea of an infinite mind instead of a spacial reality. These conclusions make the vivid experiences of sense most doubtful values, and lift up into pre-eminence those dim, but more immediate, values disclosed in man's inner consciousness. Personality, creative freedom, reason, duty, and the back-lying infinite—these become the realities of experience when

once the world has been seen from this newer scientific point of view. Naturalism is only a creed, a dogma, and as a dogma it does not have a tithe of the support belonging to the creed of Christ. The actual data of science are against the dogma of absolute uniformity. The breaks in the evolutionary process are numerous and manifest. They are definitely contrary to, rather than supports of, the dogma of uniformity. The conclusion of physicists that the ultimately small in nature is lawless is also contrary to the doctrine of absolute uniformity. Man's intuitive sense of freedom excludes absolute uniformity. Man's inescapable sense of moral obligation and responsibility presupposes freedom and makes absolute uniformity an impossibility. The total fact of Christ, beginning with the prophetic foregleamings of Him and concluding with His transforming influence in history are contrary to absolute uniformity.

There is doubtless an order of nature, a body of law-abiding forces; but they do not bound reality. Beyond and above them is the free spirit of man, and beyond and above all is the free creative mind and will of the Triune God. The supernatural is thus a part of the very order of nature in man's own free personality; and the larger supernatural of Christ becomes not only possible but probable, and not only probable but a stupendously certified fact. The martyr witness of the Christians of the first generations cannot be dismissed just because our naturalistic philosophy does not like it. Naturalism is not science. It is only an unsupported dogma, a creed; and as a creed it is not only morally and spiritually bankrupt, but it is in fact a withering blight upon the soul of the human race. The creed of Naturalism has less support than the creed of Christ. It is challenged at once by the record of the rocks, and by the deepest

intuitions of the human soul. It is time that a spiritually outraged generation turn away from this fond delusion and fix its interests again upon the most sublime body of truth that ever has challenged attention—the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Powerful, indeed, and timely are those tremendous words of the Apostle with which we began, ‘Hold fast the reliable synopsis which in the faith and love of Jesus Christ you received from me. Guard the precious trust through the Holy Spirit which dwells in us.’ This ought to be the watch cry of our generation, for in it is its promise, and its only promise, whether of truth or of life.

HADDONFIELD, NEW JERSEY.

THE LEVITICAL OFFERINGS

By REV. J. RUSSELL HOWDEN, St. Peter's Vicarage, Southborough, Tunbridge Wells, England

AMID ALL THE VARIED contents of the Bible there is one great theme ever present. It is the problem of reconciliation between God and man. *How should man be just with God?* (Job 9:2.) All the cosmogony, biography, history, and prophecy of the Bible really have this great question in view.

And there are two chief answers to the question. It is still matter of dispute which of these answers is historically the older. One answer is, that man can be justified only on the ground of propitiation and sacrifice. The other is, that such reconciliation must be brought about through the repentance and amendment of the sinner himself. The first named is the answer given by the Levitical code. The second is that given by the prophets. Today it is the fashion to say that the prophets were anterior to the Law. In former days it was more usual to follow the order given in our Bibles. For the Law avowedly comes first and the prophets subsequently. Upon this view it is suggestive that God's provision for the sinner should precede any call on the part of God's messengers, the prophets, for a moral response on the part of man.

But this beauty and significance of suggestion is not perhaps sufficient by itself to establish the historicity of the Bible order. For our present purpose it may serve if we recall the fact that the Law is said to have been given to Israel through Moses. Now Moses was not a

priest. He was a prophet, and the first of the prophets. (*Cf.* Deut. 18:15.) Upon the view that the code of the Law was first promulgated in the fifth century B.C. by the priesthood for the establishment, upon a basis of divine right, of the ritual of the Law, it seems passing strange that its origin should have been ascribed to a prophet. If there had been really such a clash of views and of claims as some critics would have us believe, this indeed seems an inexplicable problem. We shall, I think, get nearer to the heart of the meaning of the Old Testament if we follow the account which the Old Testament gives us of itself.

That account is that the Levitical code began to be given to the people within a few weeks of their departure from Egypt. (Ex. 19:1.) Three months to the day after they had fled from Egypt they arrived in the desert of Sinai. There they encamped, and there they remained for eleven months. (Num. 10:11.) The Bible account of that eleven months may be summed up in two lessons taught by God through Moses to the people. The first lesson was the utter and unapproachable holiness of God. Sin could not coexist with God. And the sinner, as a sinner, could not draw near to God without involving himself in instant destruction. And the second lesson was that God desired man, even though he were a sinner, to have a way of access to Himself. That way of access involves a dual interaction between God and man. On the one hand God must meet man in pardoning grace. On the other hand man must draw near to God in true repentance. God's pardoning grace cannot be merely the exercise of a divine prerogative, for pardon by prerogative always means one of three things:

(1) That the criminal is too powerful to be punished,

(2) that the evidence against him is inconclusive, or,

(3) that the law itself under which the criminal is condemned is recognized as being unjust.

None of these three conditions is present in the case of the sinner and God.

Therefore God's character is involved in discovering a mode by which His pardoning love may have scope, and yet one by which His own righteousness shall not be compromised. It may be remarked at this juncture that only God Himself could know the exact conditions necessary to be fulfilled. In the divine counsels it was clear that this meant that somehow God should so identify Himself with man as that He should bear in Himself and exhaust the whole consequences of man's sin. But though this is plain to us who have the New Testament in our hands, it was not so revealed in its fulness to the men of the older dispensation. God's approach to man was signalized not as yet by His own self-identification with the sinner. Such identification was in the fulness of time to be accomplished through the Lord Jesus Christ. But through the sinner's own voluntary self-identification with a sacrifice appointed by God could God and man meet. It was God drawing near and meeting man, for the mode was God-appointed and God-directed down to its most trivial details. But it was for man to venture upon the bridge which God had thus thrown across the gulf between them.

The idea of the necessity and appropriateness of sacrifice for this purpose is one which human nature has seldom found any real difficulty in entertaining. In heathen systems, whatever else of truth has been lost,

the idea of the efficacy of sacrifice always retains its place. This may most reasonably be accounted for by believing that it formed part of the primeval relation of God to man. And this belief finds its corroboration in the Bible where it seems that the history of sacrifice goes back to the very gates of Eden. After the transactions recorded in Genesis 3 it seems natural to suppose that the coats of skins spoken of in verse 21 were the skins of animals slain in sacrifice. Now sacrifice is a horrible and bloody business and an altar is a revolting place. It is highly significant, however, that it was to Adam, just fresh from his disobedience, that the first experience of the suffering involved in the taking of life seems to have come. Not otherwise was it at Sinai. It seems as if in Moses' time, at any rate, bloody sacrifices were unknown to the Egyptians. Offerings there were, but not perhaps those which necessitated the shedding of blood. (See Mr. Crum's article on Egypt in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*.) But before the people could leave Egypt the Passover was slain, and when they reached Sinai the whole complete round of sacrificial observances was promulgated to the people.

The narrative of these offerings and promulgations at Sinai comes to the reader with something of a shock. Destructive criticism regards the whole thing as wildly impossible, and the most conservative student may freely concede that for the widespread and general observance of the sacrificial ritual we must look onward to the time when Israel had become settled in the land of promise, and indeed on to the time of the completion of the temple itself. But even if that were so, that is no reason why the laws of the sacrifices should not have been made known at Sinai. And if they were thus made known, the very elaboration of the ordinances must have

been a shock to the people, as it is to us who read the narrative these four thousand years after. And indeed I think we may say they were designed by God so to be. The thoughtful and spiritually minded among the people would be sure to inquire what was the meaning of this elaboration; they would be impelled to question the reason for the substitution of this ritual for the simple worship to which they had been accustomed. (*Cf.* Ex. 24:5.) And such pious Israelites could hardly fail to read the right answer to their inquiries. Everything that had to do with their experiences at Sinai tells the same story. God was holy; they were sinners. The inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that even Moses said, "I exceedingly fear and quake" (Heb. 12:21). If man is to appreciate the grace of God he must necessarily know something of his need of that grace. And that that grace came to him mediated through the complicated and costly means of the Levitical offerings, was, we may say, meant to make men know that it was no light thing for God to forgive sin.

And this lesson was intended to lead up to the yet further one, that God's grace demands a real ethical response on the part of man. The command to repent is never in the divine intention separated from the invitation to sacrifice. The prophetic call to repentance follows in logical order the invitation to make a covenant with God by sacrifice. (Ps. 50:5.) History and logic combine to present the two things in that order. And man's subjective personal ideas of what ought to have been the order should not be allowed to invalidate the evidence.

Further, there are students who think that the prophets belittled the idea of sacrifice. They say that

repentance is all that a man needs to get right with God. But this overlooks the fact that a man's past abides in the present as experience and habit and guilt. A present repentance, whether for us today or for the Israelite of old, cannot deal with past guilt nor can it nullify past experience. Nor, on the other hand, can the present offering of sacrifice, be it never so costly, affect in itself the soul's attitude and relationship to God. It is the repentance of the offerer which makes the sacrifice acceptable. Repentance without sacrifice leaves the problem of past guiltiness unsolved. Sacrifice without repentance degrades religion into magic.

Nothing is more noticeable in the Biblical account of these Levitical offerings than the constant reference which is made to the offerer's own acts and states of mind. Thus in the trespass offering he shall restore it in the principal and add the fifth part thereto and give it to him unto whom it appertaineth in the day of his trespass offering. (Lev. 6:5.) Or again in the sin offering, if anyone of the common people sin through ignorance and doeth somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done and is guilty, or if his sin which he hath sinned come to his knowledge, then he shall bring his offering. (Lev. 4:27-28.) Closely parallel with this is the emphasis laid upon the action of the worshiper's own voluntary will in the case of the burnt offering. (Lev. 1:3, etc.) The Mosaic code knew nothing of any benefit accruing to the worshiper *ex opere operato*. And even when repentance or the state of the man's own mind is not explicitly mentioned, it is never very far away from the thought of the writer.

We must next notice the ultimate scope of these five great offerings. Neither sin nor trespass offering

availed in case of grave faults; for example, blasphemy (Lev. 24:14), idolatry (Ex. 22:20), Sabbath breaking (Num. 15:30), spiritism (Lev. 20:27), cursing parents (Lev. 20:9), murder (Num. 35:31), oppression (Ex. 22:21), man stealing (Ex. 21:16), sins of the flesh such as adultery (Lev. 20:10), incest (Lev. 20:11-14), unchastity (Deut. 22:21), rape (Deut. 22:25), sodomy (Lev. 20:13), bestiality (Ex. 22:19) were all offenses outside the protective covering of the sin and trespass offerings. The foregoing list practically goes through the whole range of the Decalogue. The Israelite who sinned against that code was cut off from his people; he died under the guilt and curse of the Law; the wrath of God fell upon him; and there was no mercy.

It might then be asked, Whereunto served these sacrifices? Of what avail were they? The answer seems to be a twofold one. In the first place, the guilt of Israel presented a moral problem for God. How could a holy God go on having dealings with an unholy people? Besides such criminal offenses as I have enumerated there were many other things which, if not crimes, were sins. Some of them might well be sins of ignorance; but they were still sins. (*Cf.* Lev. 5:1, etc.) And wherever sin is there it evokes against it the righteous judgment of God. The reaction of God's wrath against sin always means destruction. And in so far as the sinner is found still identified with his sin it means the destruction of the sinner with his sin. The sins against the Decalogue were sins of presumption. (Ps. 19:13.) No Israelite accustomed to the reading of the Law could fail to know that such things were sins, and as such would receive the due reward of condemnation. (*Cf.* Luke 23:41.) That was one peril; but there was another.

There were secret faults. (Ps. 19:12.) Things which a man might do in utter ignorance that he was doing them. And it was to provide for such emergencies that the sin and trespass offerings were provided. It is an old maxim that *ignoratio legis non factum excusat*; and if that is necessarily considered reasonable in human affairs it is not less so in divine. It is so in the realm of nature; why should it be thought that it could be otherwise in the realm of the spirit? If you lay hold of a conductor rail it is no use trying to explain to the electric current that you did it in ignorance. Ignorance may be vital in nature or in social relations; it may be not less so in our relations with God.

The importance of all this is that it is something more than a matter of mere antiquarian interest. These old Levitical laws are not just survivals from a remote religious past. They do not really belong to the category of religious ideas which man has outgrown in his evolution. They are permanent and abiding facts. They have a meaning for today as much as they had thirty-five hundred years ago. For Christians may sin as well as Israelites, and that not in little things only, but also in great things. A Christian may even commit a crime against the righteous laws of his country, and if he does he deserves not less but more punishment than the non-Christian because he is sinning against more light. And he may offend against the great moral imperatives of God's holy law, for not even the church of God has outgrown the Decalogue. "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor. 10:12). Ananias and Sapphira fell amid tides of Pentecostal blessing. (Acts 5.) It is facile just to regard them as examples of mere professing Christians. As to their real position in the sight of God the Bible is silent,

and therefore we do better not to judge. But there is something more remarkable yet. God's Word explicitly lays it down that God reserves to Himself the right to visit one of his children with punishment and even with death. And this has nothing to do with Sinai, but with Pentecost. (1 Cor. 11:30-32.)

Further it is to be noticed that these offerings have nothing to do with the admission of the outsider into the Hebrew fold. The very first verse of Leviticus makes this plain. The Lord called unto Moses and spoke unto him out of the tabernacle; this presupposes all that has gone before. It is the Lord in the midst of His people who thus issues His call. He is speaking to them out of the tabernacle which they have constructed at His bidding and according to His directions. It is not God sending forth missionaries. The situation is not that of a mission to the unsaved, but rather of a convention for the deepening of the spiritual life. It is not to teach us about how Christ can seek and save and justify the lost and the ungodly, but how He can sanctify those who are already saved. And if we ask, Where then shall we find any picture of Christ's Saviourhood in the initial meaning of that great term? the answer is plain; that aspect of our Lord's work is set forth in the Pass-over. That was the ordinance by which the stranger (Ex. 12:48) became a fellow citizen with the saints and of the household of God. (Eph. 2:19.) The five Levitical offerings therefore represent the work of the Lord Jesus Christ on behalf of the Christian; and that in itself is an arresting fact. For so many seem to think that once they have been saved they are so to speak independent of Christ; while others think that, having been once saved, they are thereafter left to run alone as best they may. As against both of these erroneous ideas

the Bible shows us that the Lord Jesus Christ is ever active on His people's behalf, their great High Priest now appearing in the presence of God for them. (Heb. 9:24.)

The whole Levitical system is therefore intended to set forth the whole work of Christ. And every part of that system, both the Passover and the five offerings, find their fulfilment in the one historical fact of Christ on Calvary. The Passover sets forth Christ's death as having power to justify the ungodly; the five offerings set forth that death as having power to sanctify those who have been thus justified.

And, first, it is to be noted that the very existence of these sacrifices presupposes the continued presence of sin in the Israelite. People find fault sometimes with the penitential language of the *Book of Common Prayer*. It is suggested that this language points to a defective Christian experience. But in the light of the Levitical offerings it appears that our Reformers had Scripture as well as common sense on their side when they penned the affecting words of the General Confession or the prayers of the Litany. And as a general rule, the holier a man is the more ready is he to apply to himself such expressions of penitence and desire for forgiveness.

In the next place, the five offerings divide naturally into two sections. The first section consists of the burnt, the meal, and the peace offerings, all of which are described as offerings of a sweet savour unto God. (Lev. 1:13; 2:9; 3:5.) The second section comprises the sin and the trespass offerings, which are not so described. These two sections together set forth the doings and the dying of the Lord Jesus, His life and death, His perfect obedience and His efficient sacrifice.

Together they show forth that offering of Himself which culminated in Calvary, but which properly speaking includes, not only His death, but His whole life of perfect faith and obedience which led up to that death.

The exposition of the five offerings has often been made, and the general lines are familiar. Nor is it our present purpose to traverse again such oft trodden ground. In this portion of our study let it be noted only that in the five sacrifices you have the work of the Lord Jesus set forth in its historical order. Thus the burnt offering speaks of His consecration which was involved in the very idea of His becoming incarnate. The meal offering speaks of His conversation, His intercourse, with the men among whom He came to live. The peace offering speaks of His continual communion with the Father through all the circumstances of His earthly life. And the sin and trespass offerings together speak of the consummation of His atoning work on the cross. The sin offering shows forth that atonement mainly in relation to sin as guilt before God, while the trespass offering rather emphasizes the idea of sin as damage to society.

All these sacrifices were, first of all, educative. They were intended to awaken and deepen the sense of sin in the minds of the worshipers. It is indeed urged by some that the deep sense of sin underlying the whole sacrificial system must have been the product of centuries of slowly developing national conscience. Against this has to be set such a declaration as that of Romans 3:20, "by the law is the knowledge of sin." The Law was not the result of the workings of men's consciences any more than are the ideals of the Gospel. The Law was a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. (Gal. 3:24.) Its worship and observances were designed to make men

recognize and realize their need of some way by which God could righteously forgive sin. The Sermon on the Mount was not the result of centuries of Christian living and worship. Neither was the sacrificial system the result of centuries of Jewish living and worship.

But the system was not merely educative; it was also effective. Not that the blood of bulls and of goats could ever take away sin. (Heb. 10:4.) But these animal offerings, these innocent creatures suffering for guilty men, pointed on by God's ordinance to the antitype which should come and which should really take away sin. God, who alone could know the grounds on which He could righteously pardon the sinner, promulgated this method that in type and picture the penitent Israelite might know that there was a way by which men might be made just with God. And in obedience to the partial and incomplete revelation lay the temper and spirit which God could meet in pardoning grace.

One other thing remains to be said. The offerings formed a very complete exposition of the way in which the Israelite ought to walk and to please God. (1 Thess. 4:1.) Their existence reminded him continually of his duty both to God and to his neighbor. And they reminded him too of the fact that always for his acceptance with God he was dependent upon the laying down of the life of an innocent victim. Constantly the thoughtful and pious Israelite would be discovering that he had offended against God's holy laws. He had left undone those things which he ought to have done and had done those things which he ought not to have done. Maintained communion with God for such an one could only be possible on the basis of lives continually being laid down.

It is easy to trace the analogy between all this and

our own experience as Christians. Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness. (Rom. 10:4.) He is the one perfect example of a man who has wholly kept God's law. His example condemns the Christian at every step. If Christ be only an example we are of all men most miserable; for we have light such as no other people have ever had, and we have not followed it. But He is not only an ensample of godly life. He is also a sacrifice for sin (Collect for the second Sunday after Easter). The honest Israelite, confronted with the regulations of the Law concerning sacrifice as the only way of enjoying constant communion with God, must indeed have found the Law burdensome. We can understand how it became a yoke which they were not able to bear. (Acts 15:10.)

But with the Christian it is not so. Christ has died and risen again once for all. There can be no repetition of that "full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction." That means that the Christian's position in relation to these things is an easy one. But the very ease of it carries with it a danger; the thing which is lightly come by is apt to be lightly valued. We turn a tiny switch and our room is flooded with light; we do not stop to think of the thousands who have worked and are working to enable the miracle to be wrought. And there is danger that even the sacrifice of Calvary may become a matter to be taken for granted, that we may lose the sense of awe and wonder at the love which it reveals. For such a temper of mind there is no corrective more potent than the studying of these old time Levitical offerings, for in them we can see set forth in type and parable the patient planning of God to enable Him to continue to have dealings with men who are still imperfect and sinful. We see His love devising

ways and means by which He can still keep in touch with men who in many things all offend. (Jas. 3:2.)

The Christian is a sinner saved, yet still needing to be saved. Salvation, in one aspect of it, is finished and done forever; yet, in another aspect of it, it is something which is being done every day. So also is sanctification. It is on the one hand a past act complete in itself (1 Cor. 6:11); but also it is a present process ever going on (Heb. 2:11). And both these aspects of it find their illustration and explanation in these Levitical offerings.

REFORMATION OR REVOLUTION

By BISHOP H. M. DU BOSE

THE WORLD OF TODAY faces an early and dynamic change. The situation can no longer remain static, nor even approximately so. Not only the logical change of evolving history impends, but a radical readjustment, not to say a cataclysmic alteration, of the whole order of thought and life. The immediate future presages reformation or revolution. This new *situs* will result either from a widely awakened conscience and a super-motivated will, or else from disruptive and deterrent forces that are now tending, more and more, to religious defection, lawless thinking, and the nullification of moral restraint. The first of these can be defined only as reformation, while the latter can be assessed only as revolution.

While the word reformation may not be overaptly chosen in this connection, its use is justified by history and precedent. The Reformers of the sixteenth century distrained upon it, and gave to it the force of history then in the making. Since that time its definitive power has steadily increased. But in at least one direction the word, at the beginning, meant too little, as it does for our present use. It did not then wholly cover the enlarged theological emergence, or the concurrently formed ideals of intellectual freedom and responsibility, delimited only by the written revelation. It does not now wholly connote and emphasize the instant and climaxing power which is to result from that change which alone can deliver civilization and the organized church from disaster.

Also it may be said that the militant associations of

the word revolution suggest, on the one hand, a more realistic order than our study calls for, and, on the other, fall short of its ultimate moral and spiritual inclusions. Even so, that to which we have accommodated the term is more decisive for world results than have been the ordinary revolutions of history; and so we cannot do better than employ it in our discussion.

But before we seek to assess the present day situation, which demands radical return to tradition and standards, it will be well to inquire concerning the grounds and impulses of the historic Reformation, with its concomitants, the revival of letters, the new ethical consciousness, and the rise of a new administrative objective which has taken the shape of world democracy. Then it will be in order to assess typical revolutions, so as to set the hopes and perils of our own situation in the light of effective study. It is well to keep the old and the new within well defined lines of relationship, since we face a recrudescence of the intellectual, religious, and moral confusions of all the past.

The German Reformation struck, not only for a correction of corrupt usages in the church, and for the recovery of Christian doctrine, but also for the abatement of those vices and sins which came of the said corrupt usages and doctrines. The grounds of the Reformation are therefore seen to be, first, a recognition of the supreme importance of religious truth, and that in the form, and to the purpose, set forth in the written revelation; second, the absolute need for uprightness in choice and action, sin being the infraction of a divine commandment, without the possibility of indulgence for, or evasion by, the sinner. As the Reformation proceeded these two demands became more comprehensive and were illuminated by a growing understanding of the history

which Providence had prepared against the time of reform. Where religious and moral conscience has remained active the protest of four centuries has not shifted from these grounds.

But the abnormality of our times has left the Reformation consciousness latent or disturbed to an extent unparalleled. Multitudes who give outward conformity to the demands of religion are sadly heretical and, oftentimes, lawless in matters of moral sense and obligation; while as frequently are found those who hold a creed of morality whose religious faith is as vapid as the winds. This too truly tells the story of the day with whose unreasoning reactions we are contending. The age is intellectual; but its sins, likewise intellectual, have become paralyzing and deadly. Indeed, they have taken on a refinement of iniquity which gives to the immorality of the age a distinct classification. We must traverse this more completely in another connection.

The Reformation of Luther developed almost concurrently with the revival of letters. Not only did that revival create an atmosphere favorable to the work of the Reformers, but, after the divine impulsions which moved them, it was the chief cause and spring of revolt against the theology and abuses of the medieval church. In no period or crisis of Christianity, save in the Gospel mission of St. Paul, has culture counted for so much as in the Reformation period. The culture which came to the aid of truth in that crisis was wholly favorable to the letter, as also to the spirit, of the written Word. But how differently the case stands today is known too sadly well. This has become the burden of a new prophecy of warning. Culture itself has come to need reformation.

The new ethical consciousness which came with, or, more properly, which came of, the Reformation was such

as was chiefly influenced by the intellectual spirit. It did not go into explications of particular commandments, nor did it erect new standards of conduct. As in the matter of doctrines, it simply cleared the accepted standards of medieval rubbish. But, beyond the slightest degree of qualification, a new and profound ethical awakening followed the Reformation. It was not that there was carried into post-Reformation times an ideal moral sense, or that the intellect and the moral sense came to a perfect balance; but the world as a whole did answer to the protests of those young scholars of the revival whose learning made them more than matches for the doctors and cardinals of Rome, and whose lives of moral loftiness were a more effective protest than even their revised theology. At least, the Reformers and confessors for the two succeeding centuries held unquestioned "the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." Likewise they accepted the authority of the commandments. This record abides.

But in the face of this goodly precedent, it must be confessed, there has fallen upon us a time in which the chief priests and the elders without number have set themselves to juggle and discomfit the truths and doctrines of the Book. Also, of those who have been numbered of the angel of the inkhorn a company exceeding large has turned aside to abet the works of unrighteousness. It is such a time as has had no precedent, a time which has come to the shining of a marvelous light, but, alas, has found that light but darkness. Aptly, indeed, apply the words: "If, therefore, the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!"

But to return to our order. The new moral sense went naturally and immediately into political administrations, and began to arouse, though ever so imper-

fectly, a new sense of liberty for the individual and freedom for the general body. The feudal system began to develop community centralities. The smaller states, held within the loose bonds of what was known as "the Empire," began to combine for individual ends, and, especially in Germany, for the protection of the new faith. The discovery of new lands beyond the seas stirred feelings of wideness and quickened the human imagination to a degree hitherto unexampled. The world began to dream, though incoherently, of how to make itself safe for democracy. A spirit of invention also sprang from the midriff of the revival and began to prophesy the conquest of the forces of nature.

The new age came, and that with thunders of might. In the picturesque language of M. Taine, the historian of the Renaissance, "Men opened their eyes and saw." The whole new world situation was favorable to the prophetic advance of morality and faith, on the basis of inerrant revelation. A passion for the Gospel moved the courts of kings and stirred the ranks of the common people. The Kingdom, though not truly come, was a vision that dimmed the glory of all secular enterprise. Such was the oneness of the ideal concerning religion, morality, and the welfare of the state.

But after four hundred years the order is reversed to a point that brings all but despair to the hearts of many who work and wait for the Kingdom. It is no abatement of hope or contradiction of faith to give a just account of existing and contending conditions. The world is divided as to the things fundamental in faith and righteousness. Society, the commonwealth, and the church have yielded to invasions of doubt and reaction. There must come a reckoning that will decide the issue. The bravest may pale, the strongest may tremble, until the hour has struck,

for until then the decision is in the balance. It rests with men. The new earth is in reserve of the will of Heaven. Within a twelvemonth America may turn back the clock of her destiny. The Gospel of the churches is before Pilate. Another generation may revert to the spiritual level of the French Cyclopedists. One thing only can avert this, and that is the return of the ancient Pentecost. When theological honesty is restored to the pulpit and the seminary, and when the baptism of fire comes to those who teach and those who hear, the church will recover its Gospel and find again its Christ. Also the overflow will reach the life of the commonwealth and consolidate churchmen and statesmen into the citizenship of righteous believing and righteous living.

But, to look the sadder possibility in the face, what are the precedents of such revolution as awaits us, should America, and the world with her, decide to reject our Gospel with its code of truth and its ideals of righteousness? Two revolutions, to go no further than the French and Soviet, furnish us historic examples. The French Commune exhibited, all too nakedly, not a few of those moral and religious abnormities that are to be reached as results of our treason unless something speedily happens to rebuke it effectively.

This, of course, will be counted a radical asseveration; but it rests in logic, as well as in precedent. Like begets like, and the law of moral sequence is irrevocable. The moral breakdown and the religious reaction, which nearly destroyed the civilization of France in the eighteenth century, and which has more or less typed the life and conscience of the French people since, are potential, and all but regnant, in the thoughts of large sections of the American public today. Amongst millionaires, social leaders, and even in the ranks of Senators and Congress-

men, as well as in the underworld, these thoughts take the shape of persistency. He that runneth may read.

The Russian Soviet Revolution is all too crass and vulgar, either on its moral, religious or political side, to command a patient comparison; but there is in its record an abundant warning. And, contradictory as the suggestion may seem, the contemporaneous Soviet abomination is more a warning to religious leaders and the sponsors of theology than is the finished history of the Commune. The revolution in Russia is radically, if not mainly, a religious revolt. The patriarchs, the bishops, and the priests of the so-called Orthodox Church made a travesty of the doctrines of their faith, and so provoked a religious reaction which spelled out the Sovietism of the present order. The pulpits of America hold its destiny in their hands. For the next fifty years they must account for the religious, moral, and material wellbeing of the people and their commonwealth.

But I am now to take up the present day situation, especially in America, for a more detailed study of the influences which may turn suddenly to reformation, or break as suddenly into revolution. Such study is well; for the churches should be admonished, if not otherwise, by the arrested growth in their membership and the depletion of their exchequers; while the republic should be alarmed at the criminal boldness of the underworld, the arrogance of the classes, and the perennial peril of panics and strikes often revolutionary in themselves. The fate of many a people, for good or for ill, has culminated in a day.

1. Let us then, first, inquire into the state of theological thought as expressed in very many pulpits and in a majority of the seminaries of the churches. All denominations are involved in this defection, some to a less, some

to a greater, extent; but the fact of lapse can no more be doubted than the existence of the offending pulpits and seminaries themselves. The Gospel of today is not the Gospel of fifty years ago; it is not the Gospel for the realization of which the church leaders of the eighteenth century vigiled in prayer and agonized in labors. Assuredly it is not the Gospel that came forth with the birth throes of the Reformation. If a plea be entered that the modern Gospel has been brought into accord with science, then let it be said that science itself is a bruised reed upon which it is madness to lean in the presence of the judgments of truth. The science of today is not that robust knowledge of nature, of life, and of the Creator that prevailed before the present bondage of materialism came upon us. The philosophers, for the most part, are as far astray as are the self-centered pundits of our theological groups.

Within thirty years certain theological groups, referred to above, have discarded the most fundamental truths of the Scriptures and the century honored creeds of Christendom. The virgin birth of the Christ, not a dogma, not a doctrine, strictly construed, but pre-eminent history, left to the church in duplicate statement and in literal terms, has been excluded from belief; though with a conformity like that of Satan at the conventicle of the sons of God, confession of it continues to be made every Sabbath from the ritual of the church. A revelation that is not full and dependable in every part is no revelation at all. A Gospel that is not out of the life mystery of the personality of God is likewise no Gospel at all.

The Virgin Birth is the Gospel; for it there is no substitute thinkable or possible. It is the substance, the soul of revelation, and the power dwelling in the divine Word.

But that part of the American pulpit which has in most constant requisition the radio and the forum of the metropolitan press, and which basks in the goldshine of corporate wealth, has declared this vital historic fact of the evangel to be unbelievable. The collusions of boldness and error which have fallen in with this heresy have brought crisis to the churches and impotency to their theology. The evangelical bodies in America will not be able to hold together for another half-century unless a power shall fall from the heavens and give rebirth to the bewildered faculties of their seminaries and the limping gospellers of their pulpits. Or must this generation of false teachers, largely delivered unchanged from the Egyptian bondage of defeated destructive criticism, be left to perish in the wilderness, thus giving place to successors who will take up the ark and bear it to its final rest? God knows.

It now seems unnecessary to go into a detailed review of the departures instituted in those sections of the church whose ministers have played false to their trust. With the Godhood of the Christ surrendered there remains nothing for which a serious argument might be made. But it is perhaps only just to say that these false apostles—there were false apostles at the beginning—have found it easy to lay unholy hands on the record of the Galilean miracles, on the truth of the blood Atonement, the glory of the bodily rising and the eternal session at the right hand of the Father. The casket has been forced, the jewels have been scattered, and the loss is absolute. What further sacrilege could be perpetrated?

2. Concurrent with this theological distress, as already noted, has come an exhibit of retrograde philosophy. The moral hope of the world cannot persist on the basis of the philosophy of our day. It is centerless, ma-

terialistic, and all but godless. It is without the noumenal sense or sight. The cosmos is a soulless plenum. Humanism has supplanted Theism, and the springs of faith and motive are the behavioristic impulses that are produced as naturally as the juices of the body or the secretions of the brain. A favorite illustration of this behaviorism, as it seems, is that man is an aeolian harp, and not a violin, an instrument played upon by vagrant winds of sense and impulse, and not handled by a master, who gives through it expression of the higher soul.

To be sure, there are philosophers and philosophers, as there are theologians and theologians; but the psychologists and the metaphysicians who assume to speak with authority are such as have been indicated. Theirs is not the philosophy of Bacon and Newton and Berkeley, nor even of the sanest of the monists of the noontide of the nineteenth century. Colluding with a degenerate theology, philosophy has created a situation in world thought whose alternative is dynamic recreation of mind and motive, or else a disruptive impulsion toward religious and intellectual chaos. Faith awaits the issue; but faith has witnessed and suffered from reactions of the motives and choices of men. It cannot be overtaken with surprise.

3. Already we have forecast somewhat the matters falling to this third division of our study, namely, the ethical reaction of the present day. The morality of the age is, to an alarming extent, a whimsical casuistry, a sophistry which tends to license and lawlessness. This casuistry operates to the end of no more than living clear of the penalties of statutes, the moral aspects of which make no appeal. It is to escape jail, but to keep the goods. This again, let it be said, is a sad admission; but truth is both stranger and sadder than fiction. Truth is also self-

contained. There are saints in the earth, and souls of stalwart faith, multitudes of them. Nevertheless, the cynical, the critical, and the lawless threaten in a way that awakens alarm.

These observations chiefly apply to the churches and their theologians, and to the ruling and more representative classes of society and the commonwealth. It is only when these are deceived and led into captivity that the foundations are threatened. But beside these, the age has developed an assortment of organizations, with varying programs, but united in commitment against religion and the higher standards of righteousness. These organizations include compacts of atheists, freethinkers, advocates of license, and even patrons of the spirit of the pit. They have been in evidence from the beginning, and need not be taken into account, except as they are finals of before described types of religious and moral reactionists. That their numbers may steadily increase is a matter the churches and the saner public might profitably consider.

It is enough to add that, although this picture has been drawn in sincerity and faithfulness, it is not held for a moment that truth is not moving in its ancient course, or that its cause shall ever be defeated. "The morning cometh and also the night." The power of evil recurs; but the mystery of the divine will outrides the darkness. God's rule is steadfast. It is only mortals who vacillate and change. Through the lapses and defections of men the God of truth works on. It is for men to withstand in evil to the end, or to yield in the contritions and restorations of reformation. It is God who drives through the thunders and earthquakes of revolution. I believe.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

THE LORD'S PRAYER IN HISTORY

By R. BIRCH HOYLE

ALTHOUGH THE LORD'S PRAYER is so familiar to us, it will surprise many to learn that the actual form of the prayer remains an unsettled problem. In Luke's Gospel there are only five petitions in the best texts (11:2-4), and in Matthew's Gospel it is uncertain whether we are to read six or seven petitions (6:9-13). And there may be greater surprise when one finds that the very meaning of some of the words and phrases is far from clear.

One word alone, *epiousion*, according to such a profound scholar as Origen, has no parallel in the whole range of Greek literature; hence there has been keen debate concerning what that word may signify. The British revisers render it in the margin as an adjective qualifying "day"—"bread for the *coming* day"; the American Revisers attach it to "bread"—"our needful bread." There is also doubt as to whether "evil" in the petition, "deliver us from evil," is to be taken as an abstract noun or as a proper noun spelt with a capital letter, "the Evil one," as the Revised Version does. Again, the doxology at the end of the prayer, as given in the Authorized Version, is altogether omitted by the revisers and almost all modern translators. It is regarded as an addition inserted in later times, probably taken over from the Old Testament passage, 1 Chronicles 29:11 (Heb.), but not an utterance of our Lord Himself.

Another vagueness in the prayer has been stated lately in a series of letters to *The Church Times* (Lon-

don). The clause, "lead us not into temptation," has been a great difficulty. How can a good God ever lead His children into temptation? Some clergymen declare that they always make a pause after the words, "lead us," as if that were a petition in itself, with the qualification attached later, "not into temptation." But then they feel the next clause (in Matthew only) comes in very awkwardly. Once more the question has been raised, Who are entitled to use this prayer, only decided Christians or all mankind? This question leads to the greater one, Is the Father addressed in the prayer the peculiar perquisite of Christians, or is the Fatherhood universal, extending to all men whether Christians or not?

In view of the above difficulties as to the form, interpretation, and application of the Lord's Prayer, it is worth while to examine the forms which it has assumed in history and the comments made upon it by great doctors of the church and by others. The forms that are given will occupy the first part of this paper. They are to be found in the various manuscripts of the text of the New Testament, the early versions and translations, and the references made by the early Fathers of the church during the first five centuries of our era. The dry-as-dust discussions of textual criticism will be avoided; there is more life and freshness to be found in the use made of the prayer by these early Fathers than in the mere lists of manuscripts, uncial and cursive, which contain or omit clauses. The second part of this paper will deal with these comments.

I. THE FORMS OF THE LORD'S PRAYER

Two forms of the prayer are given in the New Testament. That in Luke reads, according to the Revised Version, "Father, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom

come. Give us day by day our daily bread [marg., bread for the coming day]. And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive everyone that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation." Luke supplies also information concerning the time when the prayer was taught—after request made by one of the disciples, and as a supplement to such prayer as John the Baptist had given to his disciples.

This reference to John the Baptist as a teacher of prayer has a little light thrown upon it by Luke 5:33: "The disciples of John fast often and make supplications." M. Goguel of Paris has lately issued a monograph on John (*Jean Baptiste*) and argues that the Baptist's mission meant far more than is commonly thought, that John had a large following, including Jesus, and that he had definite forms of worship akin to the rigorism of the Pharisees, the asceticism of the Essenes, with liturgical service not unlike that of the synagogue. We shall see that Tertullian, at the end of the second century, feels called on to explain the difference between John's and our Lord's mode of prayer.

In Matthew's statement of the form of the prayer we note that the solitary word "Father" of Luke's account is expanded to "Our Father who art in heaven." The petition, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth," is added after Luke's "Thy kingdom come." Matthew has "this day" for Luke's "day by day," "debts" for Luke's "sins," and adds to Luke's "bring us not into temptation" the clause, "but deliver us from evil [or, the Evil One]." This last clause has been regarded by some Fathers, *e.g.*, Augustine of Hippo sometimes, as the seventh petition, though the disjunctive "but" links it closely to the preceding petition so that it can hardly be a separate one. This point Augustine perceived. Bengel

the commentator seeks to find seven petitions. He was fond of the sacred number seven, just as others think the five petitions in Luke are intended to correspond to the five books of the Law, or to the five digits on the human hand.

Various reasons are assigned for Matthew's longer form. It is held by some that Matthew took the form of the prayer from its original setting, when compiling the discourses which make up the Sermon on the Mount, and inserted it at the place where Jesus was discoursing on the newer forms of worship that should be observed by His disciples, as contrasted with those of the Pharisees. Other scholars think that the prayer was merely a linking together of phrases already extant in Jewish forms of prayer in our Lord's age, which were added to Luke's briefer form, either by Matthew or by the compilers whose materials he used. We shall see that Origen has something to say about the reason for two forms dissimilar in length.

It is argued that it is unlikely that Jesus taught the prayer more than once and in different forms, or that Matthew took the liberty of expanding Luke's account. Perhaps, so it is suggested, the prayer was in existence independently in these two forms and the evangelists each took one, unconscious of there being another. And Luke's slight alterations, *e.g.*, "sins" for "debts," "day by day," for "this day," may be due to his adapting Jewish phrases to the Gentile mentality of Theophilus, for whom his Gospel and Acts were written, as Theophilus would not be familiar with Jewish customs.

Upon the form which Jesus taught, the rest of the New Testament throws very little light, if any at all. Neither Mark's nor John's Gospel gives the prayer; Paul's group of letters makes no mention of it; a few

phrases in the other parts of the New Testament may allude to its petitions, but this is very uncertain. For instance in 1 Peter 1:17, "If ye call on him as Father" may refer to the Paternoster, but it may also be a reference to Psalm 89:27, "He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God." It is possible that Paul had an echo of this prayer in his ears when he used the word "deliver" thrice in his agony, "Who delivered us from so great a death and will deliver. . . . He will also still deliver" (2 Cor. 1:11), even as our Lord's prayer in His agony in the Garden uses the petition, "Thy will be done." The Fourth Gospel echoes also the thought of deliverance, though not using the precise word of the Lord's Prayer (Greek, *rhusai*), when the Lord says in His high-priestly prayer, "I pray that thou shouldest keep them from the evil one," a passage which throws some light on whether "evil" in the abstract or as due to personal agency is to be understood when we are taught to pray "deliver us" (John 17:15). Peter also, or at least the writer who uses that name, seems to have the Lord's Prayer in mind when he writes, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation" (2 Peter 2:9).

The first citation of the Lord's Prayer in later history is to be found in the *Didache* (8, 2 f.). The longer form of Matthew is there given, with the doxology already attached, but "kingdom" is not given with "the power and the glory." We have the singular, "debt," for Matthew's plural, "debts," just as Luther has the singular, *Schuld*, in his German rendering. The date of the *Didache* is very uncertain. Bishop Gore not long ago said he thought it was somewhere about 100 A.D., in a backward part of Syria, that it was compiled. Be that as it may, the addition of the doxology shows that it had a place in the worship of the church, and the inclusion of the Lord's Prayer

in the liturgy helps to explain how it was perpetuated. Like the use of the closing words of Matthew's Gospel at the rite of baptism, it kept constantly before the mind of the church the form of prayer taught by our Lord. The *Didache* prefaces the prayer by saying, "As the Lord enjoined us in the Gospel," and concludes by saying, "Thrice a day so pray." Two centuries later we see the Greek text of the prayer as in the *Didache* given in *The Apostolical Constitutions*, with, however, "kingdom" restored to its doxology and "debts" for "debt."

The oldest forms of the prayer in Latin, as quoted by Tertullian, yield interesting points. Tertullian (160-220 A.D.) has a changed order of early petitions. "Thy will be done" comes before "Thy kingdom come" (*De Oratione* 4). When he discusses Marcion's "bowdlerised" Gospel, Tertullian suggests that Marcion (140 A.D.) had for the second petition, on Luke's form, a petition for the Holy Spirit. "Of whom can I ask for His Holy Spirit?" Tertullian asks, this petition preceding that for the coming of the Kingdom (*cf. Adversus Marcion* 4, 26). And from Tertullian's quotation of Marcion it seems that the latter read, "Give us thy bread," and had already found in Latin the change of the last petition so as to read, "Do not suffer us to be brought into temptation." Early Latin versions frequently give this alteration. Cyprian uses it in his exposition of the Paternoster (25). This expansion may be due to liturgical usage in church services; it may also seek to avoid the difficulty often felt of ascribing temptation to the Father.

The earliest liturgies, those under the names of St. James and St. Mark, show that in Syrian and Egyptian churches the clause was expounded during worship. For in the former, after reciting "Lead us not," the people chanted, "Lord, Lord of Hosts, who knowest our frailty,

but deliver us from the Evil One, and his works . . . for the sake of Thy holy name." And in the latter liturgy, St. Mark's, they sang, "Lord, Lord, verily lead us not into temptation . . . for Thine abundant mercy sheweth that we through our great infirmity are unable to resist it. Grant that we find a way whereby we may be able to withstand temptation." The liturgies exhibit the freedom with which words of the Gospel could be altered to suit the convenience of worshipers, *e.g.*, that of St. James presents the doxology thus: "Thine is the Kingdom of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, now and always, even unto the ages of the ages. Amen."

This introduction of the names of the Holy Trinity may explain the interesting petition which Gregory of Nyassa says he found in his copies of Luke's Gospel, but not in Matthew, in place of "Thy kingdom come." This runs: "Let Thy Holy Spirit come upon us and let Him cleanse us" (*De Oratione Dominica* 3). Here we see how the controversies with Arius, on the divinity of our Lord, and with Macedonius respecting the Deity of the Spirit, in the fourth century, had tinged the form of the Lord's Prayer used in church services as well as the copying of the Gospel of Luke. The late Dr. von Harnack was inclined to think this petition for the Holy Ghost originally had place in the Saviour's form of the prayer. If so, it would serve to bring out the fact that, as the distinction between John's baptism and our Lord's mode was that in the latter the Holy Spirit was conferred, so the supplement to John's form of prayer is to be found in this petition for the coming of the Spirit and the inward purification which He effects in believers.

From this survey of the various forms which the Lord's Prayer assumed in the early church, we can see that there was great freedom both in the use of the

phrases and their ordering, and the changes, like the coloring of a stream passing through different kinds of soil, reflect the intellectual climates and mental prepossessions of those who used the Paternoster. And just as the form in the Anglican Prayer Book in popular memory displaces those in the Gospels, so the forms used in the liturgies, recited at the Eucharist between the consecration and the distribution of the elements, and thrice daily by converts, superseded the best texts of the Gospel accounts.

II. PATRISTIC COMMENTS ON THE LORD'S PRAYER

The comments of the early Fathers may be conveniently grouped into two classes, the Latins and the Greeks.

Latin Fathers.

We begin with these because Tertullian is the first in history to give us an exposition of the Lord's Prayer, and his work, *De Oratione*, was closely studied by Cyprian (*obit.* 248 A.D.) and Augustine of Hippo (354-430). All these belong to North Africa, Carthage, yet they reflect the opinions of the Roman Church in Italy and Gaul. Tertullian seeks an explanation of this prayer, as compared with the Baptist's mode, in the character of God as Father, which Christ the Son revealed. "Christ would not have taught His disciples prayer before He had given them the knowledge of God Himself . . . Him whom you call the Creator recognize also as Father" (*Adv. Marc.* 4, 26). John's work as "preparing the way" passed, along with the Spirit, on to the Lord; the earthly things of John were superseded by the Heavenly things of Christ (*De Orat.* 1). "The name 'Father' is a title both of affection and authority; the name of God the Father had been disclosed to no one, not even Moses: it hath been revealed in the Son."

This Prayer, says Tertullian, is "a summary of the whole Gospel; almost every discourse of the Lord, every record of His rule of life, is embraced by it" (*ibid.* 2-3). The "hallowing of the Name" is with reference, not to its intrinsic worth, but to us men. "We pray that it may be hallowed in us" and, in effect, "in all men." So, too, of the prayer for the doing of the will, he says, "We pray, not that His will may have success—none can hinder that, but we ask that it may be done in all men" (*ibid.* 4). In saying this we enter into the work of the Lord, and like Him must show patience in seeking its extension through mankind. The prayer for the coming of the Kingdom is regarded as shutting out any expectation and request for "the continuance of the world": "We pray by the word, 'Come,' " for the consummation of the world. We desire to reign the sooner and not to serve the longer. "Yea, come, O Lord; 'Thy Kingdom come,' the prayer of the Christians, the confusion of the heathen, the joy of the angels!" Here we see the anguish of the "killing days" coloring his use of this prayer.

To Tertullian the Name, will, Kingdom of God, are Heavenly things; the other petitions are for the earthly things. He admits that "bread" may have a spiritual reference, "for Christ is our bread because Christ is life and bread is life." Then bread also is His body at the Eucharist, and after eating, the bread is the church. We shall see how a sacerdotally minded man like Cyprian fastened on this suggestion. Tertullian does not agree with the reading, "bread for the coming day" (as R. V. and Moffatt) "for He had said, 'Take no thought for the morrow, what ye shall eat' " (*ibid.* 6). The bread denotes the Father's bounty; we need His mercy also, "for to ask for forgiveness is to make confession of sin." Aptly Tertullian cites the parable of the two debtors. As

said above, the request, "Lead us not into temptation," is rendered, "Suffer us not to be led by him who tempteth"—the devil. God forbid that the Lord should be thought to tempt, as though He were ignorant concerning the faith of any man. The tempter is to be interpreted by Matthew's clause, "deliver us from the evil one" (*ibid.* 8). Like the *Didache*, the utterance of this prayer thrice a day is enjoined, "from the heart and not with the voice only."

Cyprian of Carthage quotes Matthew's form of the prayer, but knows nothing of a doxology. His dominant trait of mind is that of an aristocratic Roman, and the Latin penchant for order, unity, and peace, which lends itself to a priestly caste, influences his comments on the Paternoster. For under the opening word, "Our," he says, "the Teacher of peace and Sovereign of unity would not have prayer to be made singly and individually; our prayer is public and common, and we pray not for one, but for the whole people [of God] because we, the whole people [of God] are one" (*De Orat. Dom.* 8). Only those who have been enrolled in the civic status of God's people (*plebs*) are entitled to utter this prayer. After one has been baptized and received as a member the prayer may be said. "Among the very first words of his new birth [at baptism] he bears witness that he has renounced an earthly and carnal father," he says, and his new mother is "mother church" (*ibid.* 9). "For he can no longer have God for a Father who had not the church for a mother" (*De Unitate* 5). The Fatherhood is thus limited to those who are in the church; a universal Fatherhood is far from his thoughts.

The hallowing of the Name is referred to believers who daily need to pray it for their sanctification (*De Orat. Dom.* 12). The "Kingdom" is in Heaven and is

Christ Himself; here the political reference to the Roman Empire emerges, which later influenced millenarian views. The prayer that "the will be done" does not mean that we ask that God should do what He wills, as if ought impeded Him, but that we Christians may be able to do what God wills. That "will" is a missionary purpose; "God wills that all men should be saved," and this, as Tertullian had said, carries with it the duty of doing the will, whatever the dangers might be in discharging that obligation. The clause, "as in heaven so on earth," is taken, as by Tertullian, to refer to the body on earth; the soul, as being Heavenly, is the point of contact with the Heavenly world and must subjugate the flesh, the earthly (*ibid.* 16). Here we see the Stoic view of the dualism and chasm between this world and "that world" which has been revived by Barth and Brunner in our own day.

The "daily bread" is taken to feed the body and the soul. The preference is laid on the latter, and this bread is the Eucharist, "for Christ is the Bread of those in union with His body" (*ibid.* 18). Augustine demurred to this comment, pointing out that in the Greek church of his day the Eucharist was not administered daily, as Cyprian, with the Western practice, thought. The influence of Cyprian may help to account for Jerome, when issuing his revised Latin Bible, rendering the word *epioun* by *supersubstantialem*, "the super-substantial" bread, *i.e.*, feeding the substance, essence, of the soul, the bread of angels. But prior to Jerome Athanasius had called the "daily bread" "the new spiritual bread." Yet, when expounding "daily," Cyprian points out that it signifies contempt of riches and superfluity, and also lack of concern for the morrow, "for the Kingdom may come any day." The measure of forgiveness is our forgiving

others in order that "we who have begun to be sons of God may abide in God's peace and have one heart and soul" (*ibid.* 23). The "evil" from which we pray to be delivered includes all adverse things which the enemy attempts against us in this world; "delivered from this there remains nothing further which ought to be asked."

St. Augustine expounds the prayer several times, briefly in the *Handbook* (*Enchiridion*, capp. 71-74, 114-116) and at length in his *Sermon on the Mount*. (Dean Trench's edition, Kegan Paul, London, contains it, with many other passages.) In the former the prayer is held to contain seven petitions, the first three for eternal blessings, the remaining four for temporal blessings. "The former," he says, "begun in this world, grow in us as we grow in grace; but in their perfect state, in another world, they will be an everlasting possession." The others, the temporal, are due, "for here, in this world, we need forgiveness where sins are committed; here are temptations that allure us or impel us into sin; here is the evil from which we long to be freed; but there none of these things exist" (*Enchir.* 116).

If visible unity and an ordered community are the leading ideas of Cyprian, grace is the ruling thought of Augustine. It tinges his view of the Paternoster. "'Our Father' kindles love and a certain presumption of success when about to pray. For we receive a great gift before we ever begin to pray, to be permitted to say 'Our Father.' 'Our' denotes a fraternal prayer, embracing all men who know themselves brothers in Christ."

"In heaven" is taken mystically, "man's soul as the habitation of grace." The Kingdom is regarded as "ever present, even as light is present, yet absent to the blind and to those who close their eyes to the Kingdom"; here Augustine breaks new ground by explaining the King-

dom as God's rule in the souls of men, and not as an external commonwealth merely. "Bread" covers both soul and body; he does not follow Cyprian, but the daily nutriment of the soul is daily Scripture reading and singing of psalms. "Thou hast promised the Kingdom;" he pleads, "deny not the support for the pilgrim life." On forgiveness and its measure he observes: "What Thou doest to thy debtor, I, God, do with Thee. If Thou forgive, so do I: if Thou retainest, I retain also. Thou retainest against thyself if thou forgive not another." (*Sermon* 131, 6.) Augustine notes that in Latin copies, but not Greek, he found the words, "Suffer us not to be led into temptation." He explains temptation as twofold, where its motive is to deceive, and where it is to prove and approve. The first God never uses; the devil does. The second God employs "to know if we love Him; not that He does not know, but 'that He may know' means 'that He may make *you* know.'" "If God ceased to prove, the Teacher would cease to teach" (*Tractatus in Joannis-evangelio* 43; *Sermon* 3, 2). The "evil" from which we pray to be delivered is oneself—"deliver me from me; from the evil man, from myself," and it includes also "deliver me from this present age." So grace pervades the Paternoster from start to finish.

Early Greek Fathers.

Origen, of whom his pupil, Gregory the Wonderworker, said, "His life is one unbroken chain of prayer," wrote a treatise on prayer. Luke's briefer form of the Paternoster he accounts for "as probably given to a disciple; the Lord could have spoken with profit to him more briefly than in the longer Matthaean form given to the multitude, not disciples, who needed more explicit teaching, more perspicuously put" (*De Oratione* 30, 1). We

have already mentioned that Origen said he has never found the word *epiousion* anywhere in Greek outside of the Gospel. He preferred to explain it as coined from the preposition, *epi*, and *ousia*, and denoting "above essence." This is in line with the Greek view of the *supramundane* world, as held by Plato, the real, eternal world as contrasted with the apparent, transient world of earth. The soul fed with such Heavenly manna was thus a "denizen of two worlds at once." Thus the sacramental view of Cyprian appears in the Greek interpretation. Yet Origen also notes that, as in our Revised Version, the word by another derivation may mean, coming—for the coming day.

We pass on a hundred years to Cyril of Jerusalem who expounded this prayer in his *Catechetical Lectures*, delivered in 347 A.D. Like Cyprian, he regarded the prayer as only for believers, "forgiven their evil deeds, partakers of grace, allowed to call God 'Father.'" The hallowing of the Name, since its own nature, as His Name, is to be holy, whether we say so or not, denotes request that "it may become holy in us" by our holy mode of life (23, 11). The "will" is done by blessed angels (citing ps. 103:20), so the petition means, 'So be Thy will done on earth also by me, O Lord.' The "super-substantial bread," as he calls it, "is not common bread, but Thy Holy Bread, ordained for the substance of the soul" (*ibid.* 12). On "forgive us our debts" he enjoins, "take heed lest for small and inconsiderable sins against thyself thou bar against thyself forgiveness from God for thy most grievous sins," by refusing to forgive thy neighbors. Cyril interprets "into temptation" as denoting "being whelmed, like swimmers in a torrent, under temptation" (*ibid.* 14). The "evil" is the wicked spirit, our adversary. If "lead us not into temptation" had im-

plied the not being tempted at all, He (Jesus) would not have said, "but deliver us from the evil one." "The man who is not tempted is unproved" (*ibid.* 17 f.).

Forty years after Cyril, Gregory of Nyssa wrote a treatise on this prayer. His insertion of the clause, "Let Thy Holy Spirit come upon us, and let Him cleanse us," has been already touched upon. To his mind that clause explained the meaning of the petition, "Thy kingdom come," which it displaced, just as Origen thought the omission of "Thy will be done" was justified as simply repeating the idea of the coming of the Kingdom. Maximus the Confessor, two hundred and fifty years later, quoted Gregory's rendering and added the comment, "The kingdom, *i.e.*, the Holy Spirit," a comment which St. Paul would have endorsed (*cf.* Rom. 14:17). Gregory applies the petition thus: "Let him that esteemeth the coming of the Kingdom cry mightily for the fighting alliance of the Holy Spirit" (*De Orat. Dom.* 3). This spiritual view of the coming, which Augustine in the next generation reached, is in keeping with John's Gospel, which substitutes the coming of the Paraclete for the parables of the return of the King. He comes in the Comforter and brings God's reign when he comes.

"Daily bread" to Gregory means, "not luxury, not wealth, nor flowery purple robes nor golden ornaments, but bread enough to preserve the nature of the body." Hence the American Revisers with "needful" are at one with Gregory, "It is the bread of daily need."

One other Greek Father, Chrysostom, John of the Golden Mouth, in his great expositions of books of Scripture has a wealth of scattered passages on this prayer. He, too, limits the use of the prayer to the newly baptized. It was one of the "mysteries" reserved from catechumens until their entrance into the church, after full "ini-

tiation"; hence he called it "the prayer of the faithful." "Before we have washed away our sins in the fount of the holy waters," he says, "we cannot call God our Father, but when we return from thence we say, 'Our Father who art in heaven' " (*Homily* 62). "Every new-baptized person, coming up out of the water, was appointed to say 'Our Father' " (*In Colossians*, Hom. 6). "As soon as thou sayest 'Our Father,' the word raises thee aloft, gives wings to thy mind, shows thee that thou hast a Father in Heaven. Do nothing, say nothing of the things that are on earth; thou art standing with the cherubim beside the throne of the Great King. . . . God beautifies thy mouth with angelic hymns in so many ways, with food no longer angelic but above the angels" (*In Ephesians*, Hom. 14). Here Chrysostom takes literally the view of the bread in the supper as surpassing the food of angels; this to the candidate now first partaking of the Eucharist. The joy which the prayer suggests to that orator is worthy of consideration. He quaintly turns the petition, "Thy will be done in heaven," thus: "As there is no unbeliever in Heaven, so you pray that there be none on earth." " 'Thy kingdom come' implies resurrection from the dead" to his way of thought. (*In John*, Hom. 4; *In Timothy*, Hom. 6).

Summing up broadly the comments of the Latin and Greek Fathers, we see that they know nothing of the Fatherhood and of the brotherhood of man as co-extensive with the human race, but only as limited to those who have been found of Christ. Yet they feel, at times, the duty of bringing all men to their cherished knowledge and salvation. The coming of the Kingdom is ever regarded as no gradual development of human society, but as reserved for the world to come; but the presence of the Kingdom is realized now on earth and manifest to such as

possess the Holy Spirit. These have the first instalment now of their inheritance in "the Canaan that they love." The life of the believer, as portrayed in this prayer, is a dual one; on earth they are content to be "strangers and sojourners," tempted in the body, exposed to tribulation, willingly delighting to live frugally and "a day at a time." Yet they are "in heavenly places," and seek to live on earth as life is lived in the "heavenly Jerusalem." They have mighty succor; they have "the fighting alliance of the Holy Spirit," with His all-conquering sword; they are fed by a Father who proportions the "supplies" according to need. Amid life's checkered course on earth they have sweet solace; they know they are forgiven; they extend that grace to all their neighbors, and thus seek to overcome evil with good. They toil to bring all men into the family of God, and yearn for the same harmonious adjustment of wills to the divine good pleasure as prevails in highest Heaven. They are taught of God, by God the Son, the inmost desires of the Father's heart, and it is their highest felicity to know that God is their Father.

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, but it doth not yet appear what we shall be. But we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

KINGSTON, SURREY, ENGLAND.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

By H. E. DANA, A.B., Th.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation,
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

EARLY CHRISTIANITY accepted without question the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures and their value in religious experience. As to their belief in the divine origin of the Old Testament, the Christians of the first century were in practical agreement with the most orthodox Jews. The question of the exact method of inspiration is not treated in the New Testament. As to their conception of the character of the Old Testament and its relation to life, Jesus and His disciples very radically differed from the prevalent ideas of Judaism. To the Jews the Old Testament was primarily law, a code of stereotyped rules for mechanical observance. To Christ and the apostles it was primarily revelation, containing the will and purposes of God as great, vital, spiritual principles. Consequently Judaism attached greatest importance to the Law, while apostolic Christianity was distinctly partial to the Prophets and the Psalms.

When we approach the question of the methods employed by the New Testament writers in interpreting the Old we are confronted with a delicate and much debated problem. It is not possible to escape here the atmosphere of controversy. In this phase of New Testament scholarship the inevitable has occurred. On the Liberal side its difficulties have been resorted to as a means of disputing and overthrowing the evangelical position on special divine inspiration. On the Conservative side its difficulties

have been denied or ignored or earnestly mitigated in the supposed defense of the orthodox doctrine of revelation and inspiration. Both efforts are to be deplored—shall we say equally deplored? It may be good tactics in debate to seize upon the difficulties of a problem for the confusion of an opponent, but it is hardly justifiable in true scientific investigation, where the object is finding the truth rather than winning the debate. It is likewise a policy of very doubtful wisdom to undertake to suppress or explain away facts that do not harmonize with the details of one's theory. One will usually discover that the theory is improved by modifying it to fit the plain facts in the case. The purpose here is to avoid both errors.

To one who investigates candidly and carefully the use of the Old Testament in the Apostolic Age, a clear and important distinction appears. There is an undeniable difference between the treatment of the Old Testament by Jesus and its use by the New Testament writers. In a previous article we have offered an examination in summary of Jesus' use of the Old Testament. We observed that He transcended in a remarkable way the current practices and modes of Scripture exegesis. But when we come to the writers of the New Testament we find them to be in this respect, as in others, children of their own generation. The divine nature of their Lord, which transcended His historical antecedents in many ways, they did not possess. Hence in their view and treatment of the Old Testament they reveal their natural Jewish heritage. And we could not rightfully hope that we might find the situation otherwise, for "we cannot demand of the New Testament writers that their exegesis be in advance of their times." (Gilbert: *Interpretation of the Bible*, p. 74.) This would exceed the function which they were designed by the divine will to perform. The New

Testament was not intended to be a treatise on the science of interpretation. Therefore, it is hardly just to suppose that the Holy Spirit in the process of inspiration would make the New Testament writers scientific Scripture exegetes. This would be an unnecessary employment of the supernatural, for, as it is, nowhere do their methods of interpretation mar the vital expression of religious truth; but, on the contrary, when their writings are properly interpreted and their use of the Old Testament viewed in the light of the contemporary thought life, the Scripture quotations employed by them give added force to their messages. Hence the message of the Gospel is in no wise impaired by the use of current Jewish modes of exegesis.

It is also to be observed that the New Testament writings are strikingly free from the excesses of the rabbinic schools. The general type of rabbinic exegesis we do find, but its pernicious extremes are absent. This is a fact which no one familiar with the actual data involved would be disposed to question, and it is certainly a fact of extraordinary significance. Christian faith sees in this fact the hand of divine inspiration guarding the redemptive message from environmental influences which might mar its essential content. So long as the essential content is not disturbed there need be no trouble about the presence of prevailing practices of interpretation.

Furthermore, a fact which has seldom been observed in considering the exegetical efforts of the Apostolic Age is the difference between the Oriental and Western mind. It is a fact too familiar to have attention called to it, that psychological attitudes inevitably influence interpretation. The inherently pious type of mind will give us a deeply devotional type of interpretation and will be sure to tend toward allegory or extreme spiritualizing; the calm, critical mind will concern itself primarily, if not ex-

clusively, with the historical and literary facts of the text. Even so, the Occidental mind calls for an accuracy of statement and strict accounting with objective fact which were not required by the Oriental mind. The Occidental mind deals in terms of the literal and abstract, while Oriental thought is figurative and concrete. The Oriental mind conceived truth in pictures and figures, and an idea which held a peculiar appeal could be freely linked with the slightest verbal intimation. This trait of the ancient religious mind, and especially of the Oriental mind, is to be taken carefully into account in seeking an appreciation of the exegesis employed by the New Testament writers.

In view of the above considerations it appears to be at least doubtful historical procedure to criticize caustically these ancient scribes of our New Testament for methods of exegesis which it was inevitable they should employ, and which were unquestionably very effective in achieving the high and holy purposes at which their writings were aimed. First, let it be observed that their purpose was different from, and superior to, any effort at exhibiting scientific processes of exegesis. The noble and transcendent aim of these fervent souls was to employ every accessible means in elucidating and impressing the redemptive message of Christ. This end was effectively served by the mode of interpretation which they used. Furthermore, their interpretation is not an awkward bungling of methods which ignorance mistakenly seeks to adopt, but an admirably forcible application of a mode of appeal which was familiar and effective in dealing with the religious mind of that day. They accomplished results of untold blessing to the world, and employed methods which they themselves could most effectively use and which were best adapted to their readers.

Then why should they be condemned as wrong? Methods which are not in accord with what is today considered scientific exegesis could not impair the profound redemptive message of the New Testament. This problem is satisfactorily solved, without any necessary injury to Christian faith, by the self-evident truth that the pages of the New Testament present God providing for the needs of the human heart through the channels of human experience, with no special concern for the exacting demands of modern criticism.

As we review the numerous instances in which the Old Testament appears in the New Testament writings, we discern certain distinct factors which controlled its use. We can best appreciate the interpretation practiced by apostolic Christianity by considering it in the light of four determining factors.

1. *Religious Intensity.* The most patent fact in the use of the Old Testament in the New is that it serves impassioned souls in expressing truth which has mightily gripped their deepest being. The contact of the early disciples with Jesus had imparted to them a practical religious spirit which dominated every phase of their activity. What they had seen in Him, as He lived before them, what they had heard from His teachings, what they had experienced through Him as their risen Lord, had changed for them the entire horizon of life and worked in them a complete transformation. This experience of spiritual transformation touched others whom they won to the cause and fired them with like holy zeal. These fires of spiritual passion are found blazing on every page of the New Testament. They affect every product of the life reflected there, including the interpretation of Scripture. This religious intensity inevitably gave a practical direction to the exegesis of the New Testament writers,

quite different from and far more valuable than anything of which their Jewish contemporaries were capable. The verities of the Christian revelation, which were realized to them in their experience, clothed the Old Testament with a new meaning, and this new meaning was of a practical religious import. This deep religious impulse dominates the use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers, and imparts a message vastly more significant than any mere formal compliance with the exactions of historico-grammatical exegesis.

2. *Reverence for the Old Testament.* Along with their intense devotion to Jesus and the religion He had given them, the writers of the New Testament manifest a profound regard for the divine authority of the Old Testament. To find what they considered Scriptural support for any truth settled its validity beyond controversy.

In Romans 1:18-3:8 Paul makes his classic argument in proof of the sin-cursed condition of the human race, and then, as the capstone of his array of logic, in 3:10-18 he quotes in a single connected group six passages from the Old Testament. He considered that by this word from the Law "every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgment of God" (Rom. 3:19). When the Law speaks every protest must inevitably be hushed.

In Romans 9:22 Paul raises the question, What complaint is there if God's sovereign election designated a remnant for salvation, while others were permitted to follow their course to destruction? He answers his question with three passages from the Prophets. These passages do not explain why God so elected, but, so long as he had the word of Scripture on the point, Paul considers rational explanation unnecessary.

The author of Hebrews, while contending earnestly for the unrivalled supremacy of Christ, yet accepts as an unquestionable premise the fact that the Old Testament Scriptures "proved stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward" (Heb. 2:2). It was believed by the apostolic group that in the production of the Scriptures "men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Pet. 1:21); and as a result "every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16). The early Christians inherited the view of their Lord, that "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished" (Matt. 5:18). This attitude toward the Old Testament is of course fundamental in its interpretation by the New Testament writers.

3. *Messianic Views.* Jesus was the long expected Messiah of Israel. Of this the early Christian disciples had no doubt. In Him the hopes of God's chosen race had found realization. These hopes had found divinely inspired expression in the Prophets. These prophetic foregleams were fulfilled in the Messiah—yea, must of necessity have been fulfilled in Him. It is important to bear in mind that apostolic Christianity considered Messianic prophecy as necessarily fulfilled in Jesus. Consequently many incidents were regarded as occurring primarily in order that some prophetic word might have its fulfilment. This treatment of the Old Testament proceeded upon the fundamental assumption that God had revealed through His prophets the coming of His Son. The primitive disciples had been taught from childhood that the work of the Messiah was foretold in prophecy.

Their Master Himself had recognized a Messianic import of prophecy.

It is therefore not strange that they should have been eagerly alert to find any possible prediction of their Master's experience. If the Old Testament contains any redemptive message, it is predicated on a promised deliverance, and this promised deliverance took concrete form in the Messianic hope. Hence this fundamental assumption of apostolic Christianity was both natural and right. They believed that they might find an interpretation of the Messiah in the Old Testament as well as in the deeds and teachings of Jesus, and an interpretation of indisputable authority. Consequently they searched diligently through the Prophets for every beam of light they might find. The New Testament undoubtedly records but a small percentage of the numerous prophetic passages used by the early Christians in defense of their faith. Their basal premise is as true as the fundamental assumption of redemption in history. The methods used by them in selecting the specific instances of Messianic prophecy were in accord with the exegetical practices of their time. We will join them in their fundamental assumption, while we use in our interpretation the best methods of our time.

A typical example of this type of interpretation may be found in Matthew 2:15. The evangelist sees in the Egyptian sojourn of the infant Jesus a fulfilment of the words of Hosea 11:1, "Out of Egypt did I call my son." The entire verse in the original reads, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." The reference of the prophet is to historic Israel. He is reminding the people of Jehovah's merciful deliverance from bondage. But to Matthew all the past history of redemption derived its significance from

the Messiah, the Redeemer of Israel and of mankind. Any suggestive analogy in the Old Testament was eagerly clothed by his inspired and zealous soul with a meaning derived from his crucified and risen Lord. To the Semitic mind of the evangelist such suggestions were inevitable. Thus employed the Old Testament renders appropriate service as a means of expression for the religious message of a devout soul, and the religious efficiency of his message has been attested by the blessing it has conferred upon innumerable multitudes of hungry hearts who have feasted upon the pages of his Gospel through the centuries. Matthew's use of the Old Testament has wrought gloriously in the realm of religion, even though it may have no place in modern exegetical science, any more than Genesis 22:17 is to be made a criterion for modern astronomy in determining the extent of the sidereal universe. It is not a standard to guide our exegesis; nor is it rightfully a target for the shafts of a captious criticism. We are not to look to Matthew for the ideals of exegesis, but for the redemptive message of his Lord, and this he presents magnificently.

The exposition of Messianic prophecy in the New Testament reveals to us one great fundamental truth: The heart of the Old Testament message is Messianic, and finds its ultimate fruition in the redemptive ministry of Jesus. We must beware of allowing a distorted view of inspiration to lead us into making its methods a guide for our own study of the great prophets of Israel. The guiding hand of Providence has placed the Old Testament in a different light to us from what it was to them, and the part of true Christian submission is to accept at their full value the results of Providential developments in the study of the Bible, and to conform our theories thereto. We need not be alarmed for our faith, be-

cause faith has gained with every step in the advance of true Biblical knowledge.

4. *Rabbinic Influence.* Paul was probably the only New Testament writer who had technical rabbinic training, but every one of them had been affected by rabbinic influence. All of them had probably attended the synagogue schools, unless we must except Luke, and had been taught by the rabbis. The religious life which surrounded them was dominated by rabbinic influence. It is therefore plainly to be seen that their ideas of Scripture study and interpretation would be derived from the rabbinic circles. No other ideas had ever appeared within their intellectual horizon. Hence it is not strange that the results of rabbinic methods of interpretation are to be found in the use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers. The really strange thing is that the effects are so few and slight.

a. Sometimes we find traces of the extreme literalism of the scribes. This may be seen, for instance, in the understanding of a prophetic import in certain words, irrespective of their meaning in the passage as a whole. The author of Hebrews, in setting forth the essential identity of Christ's humanity with the human race (Heb. 2:11 ff.), quotes in support of this truth Isaiah 8:18, which reads in the Old Testament text, according to the American Standard Version, "Behold, I and the children whom Jehovah hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel from Jehovah of hosts, who dwelleth in Mount Zion." The prophet meant that he and his two sons presented to the people of Judah symbols (doubtless in the significance of their Hebrew names) of the divine plan for them. The author of Hebrews quotes only a portion of the sentence, and sees in the incidental grouping of the words, "I and the children whom God hath

given me," a suggestive parallel to the close relation of Christ to the redeemed race which God has given Him. To his readers the parallel was suggestive and effective. In fact, the practical Christian reader of every age, down to the present time, has readily discerned the author's point and recognized the vast significance of the truth he was intending to convey, and has felt not the least shock of surprise at the use made of the Old Testament passage. Only the scientific exegete finds difficulty at that point, and the author of Hebrews was not writing for scientific exegetes. For the audience which he had in view, and whom he was inspired by the divine Spirit to address, his method was unquestionably effective. The message for us is in the truth he expressed, and not in his methods of interpretation.

Another clear trace of rabbinic literalism appears in Galatians 3:16, "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." The entire passage from which this phrase is cited reads, "For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then may thy seed also be numbered." (Gen. 1:15-16.) The passage in its original setting contemplates the entire multitude of Abraham's descendants, but since in the phrase, "and to thy seed," the word "seed" occurs in the singular number, Paul seizes upon this fact to connect it with Christ. In so doing he was in line with the standard practice of rabbinic interpretation, the kind of interpretation which characterized all his training. He was adopting no unfair measures against his opponents, for they had doubtless used the same kind of methods in seeking Old Testament support for their theories. Furthermore, Paul's readers would be deeply impressed by

this form of argument. In seeing Christ as the highest fruition of the heritage from Abraham, Paul was entirely correct, and his conclusion that to reject Christ was to reject the essence of the Abrahamic promise was also correct. That he should use the methods of his own day in arriving at that truth was natural and reasonable; that he should have used the methods of modern historical exegesis was impossible.

To have used what we know as scientific interpretation would have lost the battle for Paul because his readers would have been utterly unprepared to appreciate such arguments, and his opponents would have gained an advantage fatal to his cause. And had Paul lost that battle in his day, he would thereby have lost the battle of truth for all succeeding ages of human history.

Therefore we are to glory in Paul's victory, appropriate the inspired truth which he declares, and bring ourselves, through careful and discerning study of his words, to feel the tremendous force of his arguments in the light of his times, while we apply ourselves diligently to securing methods of interpretation more effective than could have been possible in the first century, which methods are accessible to us by reason of the abundant facilities which the kind providence of God has placed in our hands. The Holy Spirit was not moving upon the heart of Paul to produce a demonstration of scientific exegesis, but to impart a revelation of redemption in Christ Jesus. To deal successfully with the problem before us here this fundamental divine purpose in inspiration should be constantly kept in view.

b. Effects of rabbinic influence are to be seen in the disregard of context and historical background. In Romans 9:25 Paul quotes rather loosely Hosea 2:23, which according to the text of the prophecy as we now have it

reads, "I will say to them that were not my people, Thou art my people." Jehovah is expressing through His prophet His merciful attitude toward recreant Israel, and an assurance that they will eventually respond to that merciful attitude, while Paul uses it to show that God's sovereign election has been extended to the Gentile races, including them with but a remnant of Israel. Paul was not undertaking to produce a historico-critical commentary on the Old Testament, which would require the consideration of the context and setting of the passage, but in his divinely guided spiritual insight, he penetrated beyond this to the divine plan behind it all. He is true to the basal spirit of the prophecy, and in no way abuses the meaning of the passage, though he makes of it an application which was not contemplated by the prophet as he wrote the words. But since Paul does not wrest the meaning of the passage from its fundamental intent, he does no real violence to Hosea's message, and the vital truth of his own inspired message is in no way impaired. Though the New Testament writers gave slight attention to the historical connections of the Old Testament books, and were generally indifferent to the context of their references, yet they had a profound spiritual insight into the redemptive heart of its message, and through that insight rendered for the Old Testament a service, by handing it down as a heritage to Christian history, which modern historical exegesis could never hope to perform.

c. An example of rabbinic allegorizing, or midrashic interpretation, is found in Galatians 4:21-31, where Paul uses the incident of Hagar and Sarah to illustrate the distinction between those under the Law and those under grace. He does not intimate that the passage is not to be taken as literal history, for as such he certainly accepted it, but only points a parallel to the conflict that had en-

sued between himself and the Judaizing Christians. In fact, it is not clear that Paul intended to use the incident as anything more than an illustration, though it seems probable that he considered the passage as allegorically teaching the ideas he infers from it. This appears to be the import of his statement, "which things contain an allegory."

Then does the doctrine of inspiration involve us here in representing the Holy Spirit as endorsing the use of allegory? Yes; but endorsing it as a medium of expression for Paul in publishing the Gospel message, and not as a method of interpretation for all generations. The Holy Spirit did not have Paul writing a commentary on the Old Testament, but a living, practical message of redemptive truth for his own generation, and through his generation to subsequent generations. When thus viewed Paul's allegory becomes a powerful weapon for the defense of the eternal truth which he was so passionately championing. And the way Paul handles this allegory casts no false light upon the Old Testament. It is quite different from most rabbinic allegory, but safeguarded its use. In Paul's use of allegory we find its good without its harmful effects; in uninspired hands allegory has wrought untold damage.

As faith is struggling to find the light of truth on this problem, much help may be found in the illuminating discernment of that great champion of evangelical orthodoxy, the venerable Dr. A. H. Strong. He says of this matter:

The adoption of Jewish methods of reasoning, where it could be proved, would not indicate error on the part of the Scripture writers, but rather an inspired sanction of the method as applied to that particular case. . . . If it should appear however upon further investigation that Rabbinical methods have been wrongly employed by the apostles in their argumentation, we

might still distinguish between the truth they are seeking to convey and the arguments by which they support it. Inspiration may conceivably make known the truth, yet leave the expression of the truth to human dialectic as well as to human rhetoric. (*Systematic Theology*, vol. I, p. 233.)

This world-renowned scholar is here leading us in the right direction. He is seeking by devout yet rigidly careful thought to find the real truth concerning the actual phenomena of Scripture. The most orthodox would not ask that the matter be treated otherwise. After all, we cannot demand of God the kind of Bible our own logic would prescribe, but should accept in faith the revelation He pleases to give by the method of inspiration which His unimpeachable but inscrutable wisdom has designed.

We have undertaken in this discussion to present an honest review of the facts, and to relate those facts in a rational way to the essentials of Christian faith. These facts may have a tendency to disturb some of our theories, but they in no way detract from the vital heart of redemptive truth. Revelation is a historical process, and what we have found here is simply the Holy Spirit using historical means. He used the authors of the New Testament with their natural historical equipment.

The New Testament writers, superior as they are to their contemporary countrymen in clearness and elevation of religious conception, in ethical precision, in the practical, effective side of teaching, in enthusiasm, intensity, and impelling power,—in a word, in all the content of the religious consciousness, are yet, in the ordinary processes of thinking, men of their time (Toy: *Quotations in the New Testament*, p. xxi).

A very close parallel to the difficulty we are now considering may be found in connection with the Old Testament, where the solution is generally plain and acceptable to the average Christian reader. Many of the Old Testament characters lived on a moral plane far below

the Christian standards, yet they played their part in the history of redemption. Such is conspicuously true of Abraham and Jacob, two most prominent and significant figures. If God could use as factors in the revelation of redemption in the Old Testament those whose moral characters failed to measure up to Christian standards, then surely He could employ effectively and consistently for New Testament revelation those whose intellectual processes were not in perfect compliance with the methods of modern scientific investigation.

The primitive Christian leaders had no way of becoming familiar with the premises or facilities of historical interpretation, and hence are not open to just censure for not using what we now regard as scientific methods. However it is an unpardonable error for a modern critic to wrest these writers from their own setting and equipment and demand that they stand trial at the bar of twentieth century criticism. The present day scholar knows better, and cannot be excused for such a violation of the principles of historical interpretation. Methods of interpretation are not necessarily essential to a revelation of redemption, which means that the New Testament writers were not inspired to set up standards for the science of Biblical exegesis; hence it is unwise, not to say unfair, to hurl at them such drastic criticisms as to weaken their influence as inspired messengers of religious truth. Their influence has been more beneficial in human life than any force which has ever touched it, they are enshrined in the extremely sensitive sentiment of devout Christian faith, and they stand as the faithful and only messengers of the redemptive word of Jesus. With such issues at stake, one is certainly justified in proceeding with extreme caution and guarded conservatism.

Reviewing in this spirit the field over which we have

passed, there appears no necessary discouragement to the most intensely devout faith, for there appears before us at every step the one great preserving principle, that the New Testament was not inspired as a manual of hermeneutics, but as a source of vital religious knowledge and experience. In this respect it towers in serene triumph above all the clouds of criticism and controversy, with the testimony of nineteen centuries attesting its eternal worth.

SEMINARY HILL, TEXAS.

EXEGETICAL

DIVINE DESTINY AND HUMAN FAILURE

ISAIAH 2

By ANDREW R. OSBORN

THE DIVINE PROGRAM of redemption, as it finds expression in history, constantly manifests the contrast between the ideal and the actual. This contrast is the theme of the second chapter of Isaiah, which for purposes of exegesis may be divided into three parts: (1) The divine ideal for Israel, (2) the failure of the people to realize that ideal in conduct, (3) the consequent judgment, which is to prepare the way for a better future and the ultimate realization of the ideal.

The vision of the future, setting forth the ideal of the divine objective for Israel as a nation, is also contained in Micah 4. Which of the prophets wrote it, or whether possibly both took it from another is a question of minor importance. It shows how prophecies, which were usually cast into the form of verse, became used much in the way in which hymns are used today, to express great spiritual truths and experiences, and fragments or even the whole of them might be quoted. It was necessary to remind the people continually of their ideal destiny, for it is only when a nation grasps the divine meaning of its existence that it puts its energies into right channels. The difficulties which our nation in company with others is facing now are due to the fact that our energies have gone into wrong channels.

It is an inspiring thought, that every nation has a particular part to play in the divine scheme of things, and that, when we do the work God has assigned to us, people turn to us, just because we have the things which they desire. So, in the "end of the days" Isaiah sees other nations turning to Jerusalem.

It shall come to pass in the end of the days,
The mountain of the house of Jehovah shall be firmly set
On top of the mountains,
And exalted above the hills,
And the nations shall stream into it.

Many peoples shall go,
And they shall say, Let us go
And let us ascend to the mountain of Jehovah,
Unto the house of the God of Jacob.

Two thoughts are emphasized in these lines through the device of repetition. One is that the holy city and the temple as the center of worship and instruction are to be raised high above all else; the other is that the nations will flock to the holy place, because they can get there the guidance they have found they need.

It is interesting to compare the thought of the exaltation of Jerusalem as here portrayed with the destiny of the Christian fellowship as our Lord describes it in the Sermon on the Mount. "A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid" (Matt. 5:14). It is not intended that it should be hid, but, like a lamp, it is to be put where it may be seen and at the same time give light. Israel was chosen in order that it might be the light-bearer of the truth contained in the Law; the disciples of Jesus, as the first Christian fellowship, were chosen that they might illumine the darkness of the world through the light of the Gospel of Christ. In both cases the idea of exaltation above others involves the glory of character joined to

responsibility and not earthly grandeur. It is this spiritual glory which attracts the nations, as they turn to the chosen people for guidance after their own ways have proved vain.

This conception has a singular appropriateness and meaning for the United States at the present time. It has been given to different nations in different periods of the world's history to exercise a dominating influence on the happenings of the time. Egypt, Babylon, Greece, Rome, France, Germany, Britain have all at various times had this responsibility; now in the twentieth century it has come to us, and the thing which the world wants above all else is guidance. The insight of Abraham Lincoln perceived that our nation was "conceived in liberty," and it is our special destiny to show the meaning of true freedom, civil and religious, and to help others to attain it. We do not always realize how men turned to us in former times, nor how great has been the impression of our idea of liberty on others. But in recent years people have turned to us for other reasons. Truly we have been exalted; but that which made the nations flow to our shores was the lure of material prosperity. Has that lure dimmed the noble vision of the past? Is it still our destiny to be light-bearers?

The thing which would bring men to Jerusalem in the "end of the days" was the desire for instruction in the law of the Lord. God's Word, the Law, the right way to live—these would be manifested in the life of the people, while instruction in them was given by priests and prophets. The nations would discover the valuelessness of their own ways, and then they would desire the way of God. Their ways had been those of greed, injustice, and war; the judgment of Jerusalem would be righteous and would produce peace. As the nations learned the better

way, they would forsake the way of war and strife. They would discover, too, that the kingdom of righteousness is firmly established, while that of unrighteousness totters. The Hebrew word for "established," or "firmly set," has the idea of strength and solidity in contrast with that of weakness. (See Judges 16:26 and Ps. 93.) It is a fact of history, that righteousness exalts a nation and makes it strong, while wickedness weakens it. The nation which realizes the divine ideal must be righteous, and therein lies its unshakable strength.

Unfortunately ideal Israel was in sharp contrast with actual Israel. In the eighth century B.C. the thoughts of the people were turned to trade. Omri had built Samaria and established close trade connections with Egypt and Phoenicia, so that Israel became rich; Judah, while less given over to money getting, did not escape the tendencies of the time. Wealth increased, as Isaiah indicates in verse 7. But with increase in wealth went decline in religion. The land was full of idols (v. 8). Instead of the law going forth from Jerusalem and righteousness from Israel, the people became interested in superstition. Those flocked from the East who taught magic arts, and they found among the chosen people many who sought them and were willing to pay them. With newly found wealth the interest of the people had turned from the Law to the follies of the mighty empires of Babylon and Assyria, and Jerusalem became a pleasure center.

There is but one possible end to a national life built on the tottering foundation of money and pleasure—overthrow and destruction. The impending doom of Judah and Jerusalem is described by the prophet (v. 10 ff.). As we look back now on the records of history, we know how thoroughly the prophecy was fulfilled. The fulfillment manifested a universal law of divine government.

To those whose minds are not alert to discern the motions of the eternal power of the living God it may seem that we behold nothing more in history than the working of economic laws or the devious ways of international politics. The man of insight sees more deeply, and it is with such insight that we should look upon the happenings of recent years.

But destruction is not the final chapter. In the divine economy punishment is designed to destroy evil and establish good. The actual can only be fitted to the divine plan by purging away its dross in the furnace of affliction. Rightly viewed, the punishment is a process in the accomplishment of that plan. To those who do not grasp this fact the outlook for the future is depressing; those who have had a vision of the eternal purpose view the future undismayed, for all things are in the hand of God. So the prophet looks away from the unworthy present, when men serve idols, to better days, when these idols shall be cast away (v. 20). The one thing requisite for the accomplishment of this hope is that the law of God shall not be ignored. Therefore the prophet pleads with Israel to walk in the light of the Lord (v. 5). Some have looked on this verse as an insertion, possibly the work of another hand, coming between the two prophecies of the ideal and the actual which constitute the main argument of the chapter. Whether this be so or not, the thought contained in the verse is appropriate. One part of a prophet's duty is to warn the people that iniquity will bring destruction; another is to exhort them to turn to the light of the law of God, by which alone they may know how to walk. And this is the dual task of the Christian ministry today.

NEW YORK.

“NOW THE GOD OF PEACE . . . MAKE YOU PERFECT”

HEBREWS 13:21

By HOWARD T. KUIST, Ph.D.

IT APPEARS to be difficult for us in our highly mechanized age to catch the appealing significance of this engaging word *καταρτίζω*, translated by our English versions in a variety of ways, but at this place “*make you perfect.*” We speak, for instance, of a perfect performance, by which we mean flawless from a technical point of view, or we talk of a perfect day by which we imply that nothing occurred to mar our pleasure or to discomfort us. No such notion, however, adhered to this word as heard upon the lips of first century Christians. They took up a word commonly employed in the market-place and the artisan’s shop with purely mundane associations and used it, as in this passage, to suggest a redemptive value. What, then, did these first century Christians, who first heard this Epistle, “our chief witness to the feeling of spiritual exhaustion which overtook the early church,”¹ understand the author to mean when, in the benediction which crowns its close, he prayed, “Now the God of peace . . . make you perfect.”

The individuality of this word is best appreciated through its derivation, *κατά + ἄρτιος*. *Ἀρτιος* (See Liddell and Scott; Thayer, *et al.*) is derived from *ἄρω*, join, fit. The quality of this root is preserved in the Latin, *articulare*, and in our own English words, articulate, harmony, etc., each of which in its own way reflects some aspect of

¹ See Scott: *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. 197.

this simple root idea, join, fit. The preposition *κατά* (root meaning down; derived meaning, through or in succession. Moulton: *Prolegomena*, p. 115; Robertson: *Grammar*, p. 606), when compounded with this root, contemplates a completeness by the blending of successive parts into a whole. Like the simple *ἄριστος*, upon examination of its various uses it appears to envisage, as Trench has well said, "the adaptation and aptitude of these parts for the ends to which they were designed" (*Synonyms*, sec. xxii); or as Westcott has put it, "It includes thoughts of the harmonious combination of different powers" (*Commentary on Hebrews*, p. 449). What would otherwise have been merely an abstraction has been made concrete for us in manifold human experiences, either as recorded in ancient literature or intimated by its more popular applications. Is it any wonder that this word with such engaging individuality should have found a many-sided and suggestive use in the affairs of Greek speaking men?

This was a household word. When a householder, for instance, provided a guest chamber and so arranged it as to contribute to the complete comfort and the convenience of his guest he used this word to record his satisfaction. He had made the room perfect; it was fit for a guest. (*Tebtunis Papyri* I, 33, 12. 112 B.C.) When a mother sewed together pieces of cloth for a garment she used this word when contemplating her art. She had made those materials perfect; the garment was fit to wear. (*Papyrus Oxyrhyncus* VIII, 1153, 16. First century A.D.) When a thoughtful housewife prepared a dish for the family by properly blending its ingredients she used this word to describe what she had done. She had made the ingredients perfect; she had prepared a dish that was fit to eat. (See Dioscorides, first century A.D., Sprengel's ed.)

When an apothecary had so compounded a medicine

that all the ingredients were properly blended to effect a cure he described the result with this word. He had made the compound perfect; the remedy was fit to cure. (Nicander: *Theriaca*, 954. Second century B.C.)

When a physician had been called upon to set a dislocated limb and had skilfully adjusted the parts so that they might grow normally again, he employed this word when referring to his act. He had made that leg or arm perfect; when healed it would be fit to use. (Galen: *Opus* xix, p. 461, Kuhn's ed. See also Charterier's ed. of Galen, 1679, Vol. II, 281 B. See also Gal. 6:1 for an analogy in spiritual surgery.)

When a potter had kneaded and then skilfully shaped the clay on his wheel until it was a seemly vessel he viewed his work in terms of this word. He had made the clay perfect. He had "fitted" it for some practical use. (See Rom. 9:22.) Could Browning (Rabbi Ben Ezra) have been reflecting upon this idea when he sang:

So, take and use thy work:
Amend what flaws may lurk,
What strain o' the stuff, what warpings past the aim!
My times be in thy hand!
Perfect the cup as planned!

When a musician took his instrument and so tuned its strings that when chords were struck they produced harmonious music he smiled his recognition with this word. He had made his instrument perfect; it was fit to play. (For a somewhat similar use see Matt. 21:16.)

When a sailor had so refitted and rigged up his vessel that the sails were ready when lifted and spread to catch the wind he gave approval to his work with this word. He had made his ship perfect; she was fit to sail. Lightfoot, on 1 Thessalonians 3:10, suggests correctly that *καταρτίζειν* is used by Polybius, second century B.C., to apply to "mili-

tary and naval preparations," *e.g.*, the manning of a fleet (Polybius I, 21.4; I, 29.1; III, 95.2) and to the supplying of an army with provisions (I, 36.5). The applications are obvious.

When a fisherman had spread his net on the beach after the day's catch and proceeded to mend it where it was strained or broken, he used this word to describe what he had done. He had made his net perfect; it was now fit to catch fish. (See Matt. 4:21; Mark 1:19. For a somewhat different interpretation see article by Wynne, *Expositor* VII, series viii, p. 282 ff.)

What a common, workaday word this was! How readily plain, ordinary, working men and women would understand and appreciate its use! How easily those who were accustomed to bear "the burden and heat of the day" would translate the meaning of this term when it brought the boundless grace of God into direct and effective relation to the needs of their own souls. What a benediction for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to breathe upon the lagging spirits of these early Christians, whose "piety had lost its glow, and was becoming arid and mechanical" (Scott: *Op. cit.*). It is as though the author prayed: 'What you housewives do to make your garments fit to wear, what you apothecaries do to compound medicines fit to cure, what you physicians do to restore broken bones until they are fit to function, what you potters do to turn out vessels fit to use, what you musicians do to tune up instruments fit to play, what you sailors do to rig up ships fit to sail, what you fishermen do to repair torn nets that they may be fit to catch fish, may the God of peace do for you that you may be fit to do His will in every good thing.' "Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant, even our Lord Jesus,

make you perfect in every good thing to do his will." There are other alluring points of exegetical interest in this benediction, but they all serve to give added significance to some aspect of the gracious, faith-inspiring, central assertion of this benediction: "Now the God of peace . . . make you perfect."

For the sake of any who may desire to avail themselves of the complete New Testament usage we append the following: *καταρτίζειν*: Matt. 4:21; 21:16; Mark 1:19; Luke 6:40; Rom. 9:22; 1 Cor. 1:10; 2 Cor. 13:11; Gal. 6:1; 1 Thess. 3:10; Heb. 10:5; 11:3; 13:21; 1 Peter 5:10. *κατάρτισις*, 2 Cor. 13:9. *κατάρτισμος*, Eph. 4:12.

NEW YORK.

THE REVIEW

TRENDS OF THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

SOME INDICATION of trends in religious thought may be found in the curriculum of our theological colleges and seminaries, especially in those institutions which are liberal in their outlook. The old courses of training for the ministry centered around four or five disciplines: Old Testament studies, for which a knowledge of Hebrew was considered requisite in the best schools of learning; New Testament studies, involving knowledge of Greek; Systematic Theology; Church History; and Christian Evidences, or Apologetics. In some institutions Apologetics was linked to Theology; in others it was made a separate study, usually covering two years. Only distinctly conservative institutions maintain the four or five disciplines today, and there are seminaries in which it is possible to receive a degree in divinity without intensive study of any one of them. Those most in disfavor are Systematic Theology and Apologetics.

It is useless to deny that the position in this regard is serious. The ultimate question is not whether Greek and Hebrew are essential, or whether students should have the right of choice, but whether the neglect of Systematic Theology and Apologetics does not arise from the fact that the essential elements in our Christian faith are so called in question that it is not thought worth while either to expound or defend them.

The idea that Christianity can progress on the basis of an undefined attitude to Jesus and a vague credal statement is a delusion. When Systematic Theology arose in the Middle Ages as a distinct discipline it did so in response to the felt need for definition and systematic statement of belief. This need has not ceased to be. One of the grave dangers in modern times arises from our unwillingness to say exactly what we mean. Old terms are used with an altered meaning. To a certain extent this is

legitimate and inevitable, for language is in constant process of change; but it becomes a real danger to belief when the change is made covertly and the impression is conveyed that the old meaning is retained. Already there are signs of revolt against the practice, and this is significant as heralding a new day in which clear and systematized thought will once more have its due place.

In this connection it is interesting to consider how Theology and Apologetics arose and how they are related to each other. Christianity began with the preaching of the Gospel message. Dibelius rightly points out in his statement of the meaning of *Formgeschichte* that the New Testament was organized around the addresses or sermons of the apostles. It is a valuable study to analyze the basic doctrines of the messages of the Gospel preserved in the Acts of the Apostles and compare them with elaborated statements in the Epistles. These statements arose naturally in response to the interest of those who heard the Word, and who desired further information. With this went also growth in the minds of those who proclaimed the message. Apologetics, or defense of the message, played an important part in aiding this development. There is much of the apologetic element in the New Testament. The Epistle to the Galatians may be taken as an outstanding example. The attack of the Judaizers on Paul compelled him to state his position more clearly and distinctly and at the same time to point out the errors in the statements of his critics. We feel that we are under some obligation to these critics for compelling him to do so.

It is clear, then, that exact statement and elaboration of our Christian belief are both natural and essential. Church History confirms this. Those who today are inclined to speak so slightly of the elaborated statements in the Reformation symbols would do well to consider the intense interest of the people of the time in elaborating their belief. When, for example, John Knox catechized his "bairns" in public, the people came to listen, and it was the skill of the Reformer in this task that led to his being summoned to the work of preaching. Nor was it otherwise with Apologetics. The Reformation symbols bear constant witness to the debates of the time. From these facts it seems certain that the

systematizing and the defense of belief are inevitable wherever there is any real belief to systematize and defend.

An interesting book dealing with modern Apologetics has just been published by Dean Sperry of Harvard University. He calls it "*Yes, But*": *The Bankruptcy of Apologetics*.¹ He has borrowed his title from Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Schweitzer describes the position of Johann Semler of Halle in the eighteenth century as being essentially "yes, but" theology. Semler lived at the time when historical criticism was first being applied to the study of the Bible. As a scholar he approved of the method, but he feared the consequences for faith. Therefore, while assenting in a measure to its results, he qualified his assent in the interests of faith. This Schweitzer describes as "yes, but," and Dean Sperry believes the "yes, but" attitude is responsible for the bankruptcy of modern Apologetics. "Since the days when the faith was first given," he remarks, "a vast amount of new knowledge has accrued to the world's store of truth and much of this knowledge is in form, if not in substance, incompatible with the ideas of God, man, nature, and history which are found in the primitive gospel. With the passing of time this discrepancy increases and finally creates for the believer a serious dilemma. If he keeps the letter of the old faith he becomes an anachronism, if he casts his lot with the new knowledge he breaks with a precious past. Unless he and his religion are to be outmoded he must eventually make a place within his creed for truths found since the faith was first given." (P. 1 f.) After referring to the unwillingness of the religious mind to qualify its beliefs and of the scientific mind to qualify its truths, he adds: "The position of the religionist is not in these matters an enviable one. So far from being a person whose faith rests comfortably upon the support of congenial fact he is more like the Indian fakir lying down upon his bed of nails. Whichever way he turns, sharp facts press painfully upon the body of his beliefs." (P. 3.)

The position here set forth is one which must be carefully

¹"*Yes, But*": *The Bankruptcy of Apologetics*. By Willard L. Sperry, Dean of the Theological School in Harvard University. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers. 1931. Pp. 185.

analyzed before definite pronouncements can be given. In the first place, it is both foolish and wrong to ignore ascertained fact; but, on the other hand, it is most necessary to be on guard against accepting hastily drawn inferences. Moreover Christian experience is a fact, and any conclusion which reduces this experience to the level of myth or delusion is rightly suspect. Two illustrations will serve to make clear what is meant by this. When the idea was first mooted that the earth moved around the sun the first reaction of the church was that the new idea destroyed the foundations of faith, and therefore it opposed it. In so doing it unquestionably made a blunder. Blunders of this kind have been made since the beginning of Christianity. The Judaizers made it when they opposed the universalism of Paul. They were sincere, but they were mistaken, and Paul points out the fact in no uncertain way.

Similar mistakes have been made again and again, and doubtless are made today. Yet it is an axiom of Christian Theology, rightly understood, that each age is to state its faith for itself, nor is it in any way bound to ignore the thought of the age. Dr. Sperry notes a difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel, which was due to this principle. He says, "Thus, in the realm of religious ideas it is much farther from the first three gospels to the fourth gospel, from Jesus to the Apologists and Irenaeus, than it is from these latter to the break up of Calvinism" (p. 60). If by this is meant that the Christian faith utilized thought patterns of the age to express its message, and that it developed its central doctrines so as to apply them to new sets of circumstances, it is true, and it shows what should be done in all ages.

On the other hand, it is essential that the church should be conservative. As Dr. Sperry knows, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries tended to materialism and a mechanistic interpretation of the universe. Those interested in preserving the fundamentals of Christianity fought this materialism and the conception of evolution that went with it. New discoveries in the twentieth century are showing that the mechanistic conception was wrong. Therefore conservatism, even if at times it seemed,

and even was, obscurantist, was justified in its opposition. The doctrine of "yes, but" can work in more ways than one, and it is not always wrong. Dr. Sperry applies it in one way, as he sees the theologian meeting scientific statements with reservations, and he would apparently have the theologian liberalize his attitude. But why not have the scientist liberalize his attitude? Has not the time come to turn on these cultured despisers in the twentieth century, and to affirm that the "but" is most necessary in order to prevent rash conclusions which wreck the foundations of human conduct?

In one point we agree heartily with Dean Sperry; we do not like that idea of Apologetics which regards it as an attempt to "succour distressed faith" (p. 11). We learned the lesson from the Great War that the best defense is often a vigorous offensive, and the time has undoubtedly come for Christianity to recover the initiative. It is even possible that we have had too much talk of peace, when there is no peace. Is it not a fact that the church is militant, and that progress has usually been accompanied by keen struggle and often by division? Nevertheless let us keep a balanced judgment in these matters. The war was won as much by the men who kept on fighting doggedly as by those who swept forward to triumphant victory, and it may be that the apparent ebb in church affairs in recent years has its place in the scheme of things.

In conclusion I venture to affirm that a revival of interest in both Theology and Apologetics is in sight. The school of Karl Barth deserves at least this credit, that it has reaffirmed the value of the Bible. If we return to the Bible we cannot help interesting ourselves in Biblical Theology, which inevitably means renewed interest in Systematic Theology. May it not be that both will be connected with a new era of teaching evangelism? One thing at least we may be assured of, that Christianity is not dead. One of the most hopeful signs of improvement is that men like Dean Sperry, while hesitant in regard to the person of Christ, are realizing that the judgments of liberal thought will not do. (See p. 170 f.) His concluding words are that our doctrine of Christ "must be our invitation to enter into that 'Eternity of Thought'

which is the being of God" (p. 185). Such a statement is capable of more interpretations than one, but at least it indicates a recoil from the devitalized Christianity which has wrought so much harm in the community.

I would like to add, that already in Germany there seems to be emerging a new type of apologetic statement. As examples I have before me two relatively recent books. One is by Helmuth Schreiner and is entitled *Spirit and Form*; the other is called *The Answer of Faith: A Handbook of the New Apologetics* and is written by Carl Schweitzer. Both of these books are significant, and I hope it may be possible at a later date to give some adequate account of them.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

WHENEVER, IN OUR EARTHLY EXPERIENCE, MATTERS HAVE reached such a desperate state that disaster is next, there is a grim sort of consolation in the thought that at last we are about to hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Something decisive is at hand. The devout soul, secure in the trust that God is only perfecting that which concerns him, looks forward in hope, though the unbeliever may anticipate only relief from intolerable suspense. There can be no doubt that evil times serve to exercise such virtues as faith, hope, patience, persistence. To point to this fact is not to indulge any mere moralizing in the effort to keep up one another's courage; strength does come out of times that try men's souls. Then, too, minds are made more serious, and the serious matters of our existence are given more attention than is commonly devoted to them. This is why revivals have accompanied or followed periods of great public anxiety and stress.

In short, the best that is in us is summoned only when the battle is hottest and the issue undecided. Is it surprising, then, that such a crisis as the present actually inspires an exultant, almost triumphant, tone in men who have long contemplated God's ways of dealing with a forgetful and wayward race. Dr. John A. Hutton, for example, has introduced an editorial in *The British Weekly*, headed *When Our Backs Are at the Wall*, with these sturdy paragraphs:

"The phrase, 'Our backs are at the wall,' had for men of my own generation an unforgettable occasion. It was the message which the British Commander-in-Chief issued in the orders of the day and proclaimed to the world when things were at their worst. It sounded like a cry of despair. In Lord Haig's intention, I have some authority for saying, it was not that; certainly it was not merely that. It was rather his way of saying, 'No more retreating, not by one foot!' It was his way of saying, 'We are now cut off from every other resource or ingenuity or evasion! Here we stand! We can no other!' I have the same authority for saying that as he issued the message it was not so much a confession as a summons; not so much as though he were saying, 'All is over!'

but rather as though he were saying, 'Now's the day, and now's the hour!'

"That is what is in my own mind. Indeed, if I had had the courage, I should have added something to the title at the head of these columns. I should have given as the complete title: 'Our backs are at the wall! Hallelujah!' For, finally, I have no other formula for my own soul's direction on final matters than to say that God is He whom we are capable of receiving and knowing only when but for Him we should throw in our hand!

"That, however, is a truth—that the Christian faith is a *desperatio fiducialis*—so deep and, to our carnal minds, so paradoxical, that, except under some imminent distress or consternation, we shall accept it with our reason only by a *gradual* approach. There are a hundred passages in Holy Scripture where, indeed, this precisely is the lesson."

ANYONE WHO EXPECTS MEN GENERALLY TO COMPREHEND TRUTH in just the same way, or even to value it in just the same way, is asking too much of human nature. It must have struck every thoughtful student of the New Testament that our Lord has demanded remarkably little from the intellect alone. No one is even mildly advised to believe as a philosopher, but unless one can "receive the kingdom of God as a little child," he cannot hope to enter it. Despite this fact, however, there is sometimes a disposition on the part of Christ's followers to condition entrance upon theological grasp rather than upon spiritual attitude. Yet there are multitudes of Christians to whom theological explanations must ever remain a more or less closed book. Nevertheless the mind does, to some extent at least, seek explanations, even demonstrations, of truths, and these have their value in one's religious development.

Principal A. E. Garvie has published, in *The Expository Times*, a thoughtful essay called *The Synthesis of History, Experience, and Reason in the "Knowledge of God,"* in the course of which occurs a passage that has a practical value of its own, apart from its setting, for those who demand too much from the minds of believers and inquirers. This passage referred to is introduced in the course of a discussion of the mediation of the

knowledge of God and, while it makes a somewhat long quotation, is well worth reproducing here:

"The psychologist will tell us that the resistance to our own movements first gives us a consciousness of external reality, and that by observing in that external reality less or greater resemblance to what we are aware of in ourselves we distinguish inanimate objects and living organisms, and among living organisms persons from beings less than personal. What child gazing into his mother's loving face ever thought of such an explanation? These illustrations may serve to show how an immediate consciousness of God may involve an historical mediation. God's presence is no less real, nor His activity less direct, because man's receptivity for, and responsiveness to, just such a communication from God needed to be developed by just such an historical mediation. It seems to me that we best describe the knowledge of God in such individual experience as *intuition*; there is the sense of immediacy; there is no awareness of any process of mediation; and yet we cannot, when we scrutinize the content of the intuition, exclude the historical mediation. This is not abstractly intellectual, but concretely personal; we feel and we will as well as know; we desire to know and delight in knowing.

"This being so, the content of the experience will depend on the historical mediation. A Hindu saint does not find relief from his misery in receiving the inward assurance: 'Thy sins are forgiven thee; thy faith has saved thee; go in peace' (Luke 7:48-50), until Christ is preached to him as Saviour and Lord. The Roman Catholic believer as he receives the wafer adores Christ as present in the altar; the Lutheran *in, with, and under* the two elements receives Christ's body and blood; the Calvinist at the same ordinance realizes the real presence of Christ, even though His glorified body be localized in heaven; the Zwinglian, if such there be, remembers only what Christ endured and achieved for him, with no sense of His presence; but is not Christ savingly with them all? The metaphysics may vary, the experience is one. It is, therefore, quite an unjustified dogmatism to identify the experience with the accompanying metaphysic. The adoration, the inspiration, the consecration—these are the essential common reality. We sometimes complain that we do not now have the same kind of conversions, or the same kind of revivals as our fathers had. If we have no conversions and no revivals we may well lament the fact; but should we expect the same *kind*? For we do not preach; and most of us could not preach the same *kind* of theology. We do not appeal to fear of hell or hope of heaven; and

we need not be surprised if we do not evoke the same emotional response as did those whose imagination outran any certain knowledge we have of the future life. It is not the type of theology alone which affects the character of the experience; but also the disposition, education, capacity, circumstances of the experient; all those are included in what we call its mediation.

"Accordingly, we must not expect uniformity, but variety, in accordance with the mediation. But as it is the same God, and the same revelation in history with which we are concerned, we are entitled to expect unity amid the diversity. It is the same God, but the experience of Him will be more or less adequate as the mediation in each individual experience of His revelation has been adequate. For me the typical Christian experience is the realization in thought, emotion, sentiment, and action of the eternal reality of God as Love, as Father, that is as self-imparting perfection, through the venture of faith in the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ—His revelation of God as forgiving, saving, and blessing man, and His redemption in His sacrifice of man from sin, its guilt, its power, its charm—the venture which is progressively verified in the new life in the Spirit of God. Not only is my theology trinitarian, but also my experience—God in eternal reality, in historical manifestation, and in personal experience. I am not so much concerned as to the doctrinal formulation of the Incarnation, so long as it is God, nothing else or less, that comes to me in Jesus Christ; or of the Atonement, so long as I know that in the Cross God has so dealt with sin as to condemn it as my conscience demands, and yet to forgive me, as my heart craves; or of the Holy Spirit, whether His operations within are to be identified with the continued activity of the Risen Living Christ, although I prefer the New Testament presentation, so long as I know that I am not left in my weakness to carry on the struggle with sin and the endeavour of duty, but that God Himself is within me, making me what He wills.

"What the relation of the historical manifestation in Christ may be to the eternal reality of God, or to the present activity of God, I do not know; but I do know that any present experience I have of God is through and through mediated by Christ, His Cross, and His Spirit; and for me, therefore, the only knowledge of God which avails and satisfies is the vision of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

IDEALISM IS A TERM SUFFICIENTLY VAGUE TO NEED RATHER EXACT definition before it can have practical meaning in a given situa-

tion. If we mean by an ideal a standard by which to measure things, a goal toward which we should strive, all well and good, especially in our everyday affairs. If we are dealing with religious matters, however, the preaching of ideals may not only prove absurdly useless, but may contain the seeds of its own defeat; for it is so pitifully inadequate to present ideals of conduct to human nature in the hope that this solves the problem. The thought of perfection of conduct rarely moves one to seek it. There must be something beyond all this.

One of the theologians who is commanding attention in these critical days is H. Emil Brunner, and he has recently said some very clear and very frank things on the utter hopelessness of so-called Christian idealism. After showing briefly, in an article in *The Christian Century*, how "fantastic" is the hope that men and women will ever achieve, through persuasion, the practice of the ideals of Christ, Dr. Brunner continues with this plea for reality, as over against idealism:

"One hears a great many people speaking today of religion. Even theologians have taken up the questionable habit. Religion, however, is an idea of God, a God-ideal, an idol in which man deifies himself. We are experiencing today—right here on the continent of Europe—a true revival of religion. Communism, as well as its opposite, fascism—especially the German type—is a 'genuine religion.' There can be no doubt of it. The one has a certain relationship with the state-religion of imperial Rome, the other with the vital-religion of the near eastern cults. From which of these are we to expect salvation? Even in America there are new religions; and all—even that of Professor Haydon—have a perfect right to call themselves such. That each one contradicts the other only characterizes them for everybody as belonging to the religious realm. The man who asks for religion receives not one answer but many. The distinguishing feature of the Bible, on the other hand, is that in it it is not religion that is asked for, but the living God himself. Religions are deified principles, ideals, values—which is to say that they are man deifying himself. The man who looks for life in religion looks, in the last analysis, for life in himself. And this is the essence of paganism, old and new—either the pantheistic deification of the world (God is the universe) or the deification of the human self (God is mind).

"Over against all this religionizing, in sharp and solitary

contrast, one event stands out—the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, as the Bible speaks of it. In this event the central factor is not man, or man's ideas and principles, but God himself; it is not human religion but God's own act. The New Testament announces no principles, but rather the reality of the living God who in Jesus Christ made himself known to the world, and in making himself known saved men from their idolatries, their principles and ideologies, that is, their self-seeking. Nowhere does the New Testament speak of the 'person of Jesus'—else the evangelists would have taken pains to write a biography of Jesus. Nowhere does it speak of him as the exemplar of certain ideas, ideals, and social programs; it speaks of the 'Messiah,' of the 'Christ,' that is, of the one in whom the Creator of the world reveals himself as its Savior.

"This is the Jesus of the New Testament, Jesus the Christ; it is him alone that Matthew, Mark, and Luke, as well as John and Paul, report. To them he is no religious genius, but a Savior, no founder of a new religion, but one in whom God himself is present among men. He is the window through which we look into the world of God; he is the place at which we find the living God; he is the eternally contemporary Word of God present and alive today, the reality of God in the godless world.

"That it is the real God who is revealed in Jesus is made evident by the fact that it is in Jesus that man recognizes his own reality. The Bible calls this reality 'sin.' We might perhaps best translate this much abused word as 'perversion.' The world is perverted; and the center and source of all this perversion is the turning away of man from his origin, from the creation-meaning of his existence. Mankind is sick, sick unto death: all perversion is sickness. But at the bottom of this sickness is man's making himself God, his worship of the world, of the universe, or of reason, of values, of himself, instead of God. It is part of his perversion that when he begins to be aware of his sickness he believes he can help himself by ideas, principles, social programs, ethical demands. But the person who comes to know Christ is cured of this idealistic illusion. He knows that the world cannot be saved by human exertion but only by—God himself."

A MAN IS FORTUNATE WHEN HE COMES TO REALIZE HIS LIMITATIONS. We do not refer to polite self-criticism, but we mean that it is a good thing when the severe experiences of life have so cleared away one's overestimates of his powers and knowledge

that he can more nearly see himself as he is. He is then in a position to learn and to fill his proper place. It is also a good thing for a race or nation to come to an honest judgment of its right place in the world. The growing ill feeling between Orient and Occident may be traced, to a large extent, to ideas of such superiority on the part of Western peoples that they have assumed the right to trespass upon the very independence of Eastern nations. It may be hard to suppress one's realization of his advantages in life when he compares the enlightenment and comfort of his own land with backward and even terrible conditions in some Eastern country. Yet the missionary in such a region must develop a Christian sympathy and penetrating intelligence that will lift him above his natural human limitations. He has come to serve, and, serving, he may find opportunity to learn, and so may discover unexpected native virtues, capacities, and resources.

A missionary writer who has evidently made the most of such advantages, Rev. John Van Ess, has contributed to *The Moslem World* a noteworthy paper upon Educating the Arab, and it is so rich in information and so suggestive to the preacher generally that we give these rather extensive extracts:

"It implies a good deal of presumption on my part to want to educate the Arab. The longer I live with him, the more I learn from him. Beside his amazing language, my own is a hodge-podge, relatively void of form, order or comeliness. Beside his history as a son of Shem, I am a mere stripling. Spiritually, he walked and talked with God millenniums before my ancestors began to doff the bear-skin or laid aside the war-club. Indeed, in approaching the Arab I have no superiority complex at all. As the years pass, I feel more and more apologetic to him for the way in which I persistently murder his incomparable tongue. In educating the Arab, particularly here in Chaldæa, I am painfully conscious of the fact that I am only giving back to him what in the first instance I received from him: algebra, astronomy, chemistry, law, literature, hydraulics, mystical philosophy and art. I may have improved on all of these, but even some of these subjects are now in such an extraordinary state of flux that others will soon have improved on my presentation thereof in a relatively greater measure, so that I have nothing to boast of.

Particularly since the war do I feel diffident about even mentioning culture or civilization to the Arabs."

"I finished my academic training with a scholastic equipment which falls to the lot of only the few. With my diploma I was handed a complete armory of polished weapons, cold as steel and equally dead. With the lapse of years my resentment has grown that a student could be turned out so totally unfit to go to the Moslem with the message of life. The first ten years of my missionary life I spent in trying to cudgel the Arab into an intellectual assent to my position, than which I believed there could be no other. In those ten years I did learn considerable theology, however, from the clever *mullahs* with whom I tilted. For exploring Allah, what He is and what He is not, you need the Arab in his native tongue, the tongue of the prophets and seers, under the very stars where his ancestors have for millenniums discussed such things. The next ten years of my missionary life I set my theological books one by one back on their shelves and determined to diagnose what really was the matter with that obstinate Arab who simply refused to bow to my logic. By all the rules of the game and the laws of dialectics he ought to have bowed, but he didn't. It ought to have been very simple: You are a sinner, Christ is the only Saviour, therefore believe and be saved. The little flaw in it all was in the word *Sin*. When a man is color-blind, no amount of argument will teach him to distinguish colors. When a man is sin-blind, no amount of logic will make him see. And then, to my chagrin I own it, I woke up to the simple and stupendous fact of what I was here for: that Christ had not said 'Go and make Christians,' but 'Go and make disciples,' disciples of Him, with Him as the teacher and not myself at all, and that my chief, indeed my only, function is to bring the Arabs to Christ's school, hand them over to Him and let Him do the teaching.

"Now, to allay any fears or suspicions, I wish to assure my readers that I believe without mental reservation of any sort in the Deity of our Lord and in the Atonement, as such are commonly understood in the Christian Church. But I also wish to observe that, when Peter made his confession, the Lord said: 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah, for *flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee*,' the implication being that it is not primarily *my* function to convince men of His Deity, and the further implication being that the other disciples had not yet assented to that article of the creed, and yet were not for that rea-

son excluded from the inner circle. One *can* be a disciple, a learner, without a clear-cut conception of His person.

"The Samaritan woman was not convinced, or apparently much affected, by the marvelous discourse on the water of life, but by the Lord's knowledge of and interest in her domestic affairs. So it is every angle, every facet of that Life that I must present. And my emphasis must be discipleship always. Now, of discipleship the crux is not knowledge but obedience, surrender. To be a disciple implies a conflict of wills, and when I have led the Arab to surrender his will to that of Christ, I have made him a disciple.

"Does this method work? In my experience it is the only method that does work. It eliminates from the Arab's mind the idea that I am in conflict with him. It represents a constructive purpose rather than a destructive process. God knows we have too long used the slogans of war in our missionary work. The method also gives the school an objective which no Moslem, however pious or fanatical, can object to. It has actually given me a vision of what the new Arab church may become. In the Basrah school, circles of a dozen or more students each, have by their changed lives, their desire for each others' fellowship and their increased spiritual perception evinced the power which can come from Christ alone."

THE GREATEST WITNESS FOR CHRIST IS A CHRISTIAN. BUT WHAT is a Christian, and how is a person to become one? The church is supposed to give men full knowledge on these points, and that is its duty; but the trouble is that in more recent decades the church has to a considerable extent shifted the emphasis from the spiritual to the moral. That is why we hear so much about the teachings of Christ and His lofty example, rather than about what He is and about His relation to God and to man. There are many regular attendants at church in these days who are sincere, even anxious, searchers after truth, and yet they feel a vague hunger—some vitally essential element of their religious life is wanting. Can it be simply that they hunger and grope for nothing else than a personal experience of Christ?

In a recent issue of the *Federal Council Bulletin* C. F. Andrews bears such a striking testimony on this point that it should be widely published. What Mr. Andrews' experience did to his

own character and life is indicated by these introductory words by the Editor: "This moving personal testimony comes from an Englishman who has so identified himself with the aspirations and sufferings of the Indian and African peoples that it is commonly said among them that his initials, C. F. A., stand for 'Christ's Faithful Apostle.' Mr. Andrews, as is well known, is the closest Western friend of Mahatma Gandhi." Under the caption, *Why I Am a Christian*, Mr. Andrews gives this short but profoundly significant and illuminating bit of spiritual autobiography:

"My conscious active life, as a Christian, began when I was eighteen years old. At that time I was growing indifferent to all religion and falling into sins which would soon have wrecked my moral character altogether. I was saved by Christ from that death of sin.

"One night, as I knelt down to pray, there came upon me an overwhelming sense of God's Holy Presence near me, and at the same time a knowledge of my own evil life. I cried out, 'Unclean, unclean!'

"For hours of agony all was dark and full of horror to me. At last, long after midnight, I was conscious of a divine peace. The voice of Christ seemed to bring me forgiveness and love, in place of darkness and despair.

"Next morning, I went to church very early and heard the words of blessing, 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. Amen.' At these words the sense of peace and forgiveness came back to me and flooded my whole life with joy.

"Since that time, during more than forty-three years of incessant struggle, journeying to and fro throughout the world, I have never lost the assurance of Christ's living Presence with me. He is not a mere vision; He is no imaginative dream, but a living Presence, who daily inspires me and gives me grace. In Him, quite consciously, I find strength in time of need.

"It may be asked whether this experience, since my conversion, has been that of Christ's own personal Presence and in what way it has been related to God.

"I would try to answer in this way. In all that followed my conversion, Christ and God became one single thought. I did not separate them. Thereafter, whenever I thought of God in human ways, I could not think of God apart from Christ, or Christ apart

from God. Christ also became to me the practical evidence in everyday life of God's Presence. The divine beauty, truth and love which I associate with the thought of God in human life are centrally visible to me in Christ. Thus Christ has become for me in my moral and spiritual experience the living, tangible expression of God. With regard to the Infinitude of God that lies beyond this, I seem able at this present stage of existence to know nothing that can be defined. But the human in Christ, that is also divine, I can really know; and when I see this divine beauty, truth and love in others also, it is natural for me to relate it to Christ. The process, which is spiritual and universal and therefore entirely above race, sect, or creed, may be difficult to explain in words, but it is very real to me."

THE VERY REPETITION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT OF THE PHRASE, "the kingdom of God" or "the kingdom of heaven," or even the single word "kingdom" used with the same signification, should be sufficient to direct particular attention to its meaning and importance. The manner and the contextual associations of our Lord's frequent employment of one of these expressions leave no doubt that He contemplated an actual entity when He spoke of the "kingdom of heaven." It is so easy to approach the Bible from a wrong mental point of view that we may easily fall into the habit of regarding such usages as merely rhetorical, and so miss their important content. But it is necessary for a Christian to grasp the significant meaning of this term Kingdom if he is to realize the fact that, upon accepting Christ as Saviour and Lord, he has become a member of the most exalted, and the one enduring, social order. Furthermore, he enters it now, not after he leaves this world.

This is one of those themes that are largely neglected by the pulpit, so that people are left to vague notions of a Kingdom that amounts simply to the Heaven of the hereafter. *The Lutheran* properly emphasizes the importance of a clear comprehension of this subject when it says:

"We have the feeling that the full content of our Lord's teaching concerning the purpose of His incarnation, death and resurrection is not being widely proclaimed. If our view is the correct one, the failure of the church—to the extent that it has

failed—is not difficult to explain. It has become contented to ascend the height of divine revelation only part way. In its eagerness to stress the individual person's privileges of communion with God and in its hesitancy during a materialistic age to insist upon the articulation of believers into the communion of saints, it has obscured what Jesus emphasized, namely, His kingdom on earth.

"In other words, the church has fallen a victim to a kind of sleight-of-hand performance, whereby its attention has been diverted from the real collectivism of religion and concentrated on organizations and mechanisms 'of this world.' With the expansion of invention and communication daily displayed by press and picture; with the complexities of modern life and its confusions constantly entangling us; and with the skilfully advertised nostrums of irreligious teachers offered us even in pulpits, we seem to have lost sight of the organism in which faith in Christ gives us membership. Because Jesus informed us that His kingdom is not of this world, cometh not with observation and is spiritually constituted, we have concluded that it is a regime realized only after death, an appendage to the associations of social life or it is a mere figure of speech."

"Unless spiritual attributes and desires differ from all other divinely created faculties and motives, the gifts of grace by virtue of which we are members one of another and together the body of Christ, are being either ignored or misapplied. Why have the people who believe in Christ such great difficulty in realizing their fraternity in faith? Why are they seduced from their loyalty to the kingdom of God and satisfied by participation in purely temporal and often degenerating societies? Why are they content with an individual dependence on their Saviour? Is it not because they have not understood and accepted the teaching of Jesus concerning the kingdom of God? Why does our Lord recognize so emphatically the realm of Satan and the 'kingdoms of this world,' unless He desires to indicate the purpose of overcoming them through the kingdom of God? Such questions and their implications we desire to thrust upon the attention first of pastors and teachers and thereafter upon all the church's membership. Are we getting the whole Gospel into our minds and lives?"

IF WE WERE ALL CAPABLE OF JUDGING CONTEMPORARY AFFAIRS in their proper historical perspective, our hopes and fears would be vastly different from those that so largely rule our thinking.

It is amazing how much of the ground we are now passing over has been trodden by previous generations, though we think it has never before been explored. Outside the physical realm there is a surprising amount of sameness in history, especially in the history of ideas for the better adjustment of man to the universe. This is singularly true in the sphere of religion. Someone comes out with a new religious philosophy, but someone else points out that the ancients passed that way long ago, or that the Orientals are there now. Indeed, in the search after a cure for our spiritual and moral and social ills, speculation has explored about every conceivable nook and cranny, and imagination has suggested about every conceivable device.

And so we often struggle on in a great circle, like one lost in a forest, only to discover every now and again that we are just about where we were a while ago. An example of this return to old familiar ground is furnished in the recent abortive attempt to revive humanism. *Zion's Herald* has lately republished from its issue of November 11, 1869, sixty-two years, shall we say, out-of-date, this paragraph which requires no comment :

"The Materialistic speculators have, therefore, found it necessary to substitute, in the place of the sublime Christian theory of life, death, and eternity, a 'Religion of Humanity'—a sort of deification of humanity—humanity as a unit or aggregate, and as eternal, in its successive generations. It is thus that, while they deny to man personal immortality, they would comfort him with the illusion—the poetical generalization—of an aggregate human immortality. Harriet Martineau has brought herself down to this heartless consolation, and has avowed it. Comte, too philosophical not to see that the human race must have a religion of some kind, elaborately contrived one, with even ritualistic minuteness, on this idea of the aggregate and eternal humanity. Worship this, he would say; make self-sacrifice for this; be moral for this; be heroic unto death for this; there is no other God, no other immortality, no other upshot of the universe; our science shows no beginning, and can see no end to the material system; accept, O men, your functions in it, and be content. Be content? Precisely there, all genuine humanity replies, is the insurmountable solcism—the impossibility of your system of the universe. You turn the earth into a general sepulchre, and the

universe into a hell, for humanity. We find ourselves in this universe with faculties and instincts which entirely unfit us for such a fate. Better for humanity to die out, at once, than survive for such a hopeless fate."

"MISERY LOVES COMPANY." THERE IS A CERTAIN CONSOLATION in discovering that one is not an isolated sufferer, but that he is sharing a more or less common experience. In the same way we find comfort in learning during "hard times" that the country, even the world, has passed through similar experiences before, and yet survived. A review of history along this line is revealing and inspires hope. Progress has its remarkable advances and its discouraging setbacks, but in the long run ground is gained. It is singular that descriptions of bad periods often parallel one another closely, so much so that writers not infrequently repeat an account of some forgotten panic in order to show how little we have changed with respect to the religious, social, and economic effects of periods of serious business difficulties and disasters.

The Churchman recently republished from the *Message*, of the Cathedral of the Incarnation, Garden City, Long Island, New York, this account, taken in turn from *Harper's Weekly*, of October 10, 1857, which, with little or no change, might have been a description of present conditions:

"It is a gloomy moment in history. Not for many years—not in the lifetime of most men who read this paper—has there been so much grave and deep apprehension; never has the future seemed so incalculable as at this time. In our own country there is universal, commercial prostration and panic, and thousands of our poorest fellow-citizens are turned out against the approaching winter without employment, and without the prospect of it.

"In France the political caldron seethes and bubbles with uncertainty; Russia hangs as usual, like a cloud, dark and silent upon the horizon of Europe; while all the energies, resources and influences of the British Empire are sorely tried, and yet to be tried more sorely, in coping with the vast and deadly Indian insurrection, and with its disturbed relations in China.

"It is a solemn moment, and no man can feel an indifference (which happily no man pretends to feel) in the issue of events.

"Of our own troubles no man can see the end. They are, fortunately, as yet mainly commercial; and if we are only to lose money, and by painful poverty to be taught wisdom—the wisdom of honor, of faith, of sympathy and of charity—no man need seriously despair. And yet the very haste to be rich, which is the occasion of this widespread calamity, has also tended to destroy the moral forces with which we are to resist and subdue the calamity.

"Good friends! Let our conduct prove that the call comes to men who have large hearts, however narrowed their homes may be; who have open hands, however empty their purses. In times of peril we have nothing but manhood, strong in its faith in God, to rely upon; and whoever shows himself truly a God-fearing man now, by helping wherever and however he can, will be as blessed and beloved as a great light in the darkness."

THERE IS A CERTAIN SIGNIFICANCE IN THE INTEREST THAT ATTACHED to the late Thomas A. Edison's views about God and the hereafter. There has seemed to be a certain eagerness to discover that he was, in some degree at least, a believer in both. The same thing was true, though to a less extent, in the case of Charles P. Steinmetz. Incidentally all this implies the responsibility resting upon prominent men with respect to shaping the views of others in matters of religion.

Mr. Roger W. Babson is reported as giving in these words the substance of interviews he had with both Steinmetz and Edison, as they concerned religion:

"The great electrical era which the world is enjoying today is primarily due to two men—one, Charles P. Steinmetz, who for thirty years was chief engineer of the General Electric Company, and the other, Thomas A. Edison.

"During the last year of Steinmetz's life, he spent a week at my home in Wellesley. The last evening of his visit I asked him what new power might be discovered in the future which would rival steam or electricity.

"Said he, 'Babson, the greatest power of all is in our midst unscratched today. I refer to the spiritual power that comes through right living and worship. Our forefathers knew the power of prayer, the economic importance of Sabbath observance, and the need of family and public worship. To these,

America owes its prosperity and growth. Today this power is temporarily forgotten.' ”

“This spring I spent a morning with Edison at his laboratory at Fort Meyers, Fla. I visited him to discuss certain features of the Einstein theory which might have an important bearing on aviation. When leaving, I asked Edison what new radical invention he visualized as coming during the next four years. He replied: ‘Babson, I do not pose as a preacher; but let me tell you that, if there is a God, He will not let us advance much further materially until we catch up spiritually. A great fundamental law of science is that all forces must be kept in balance. When any body or any force goes off on a rampage or tangent, there is a smash. This applies to America as it has to every nation before it.’ ”

THERE IS NOTHING MORE HEARTENING TO A PERPLEXED AND troubled world than Christianity at work. There are, as there must be, certain articles of faith, if we are to have a religion, but men are rarely won to Christ by bare theology. The thing that works is the warmth of a real Christian life, full of sympathy and helpfulness. Adroit minds can at least resist an argument, but no one can answer a life. Thousands fail to realize their opportunities for Christian testimony since they are discouraged because they cannot preach or “speak in meeting” with any fluency. But their characters, their moods, their varying degrees of responsiveness, and their way of meeting chances to render needed service are a continual utterance.

In an editorial on helping the unemployed *The Watchman-Examiner* gave this incident and these appropriate comments:

“A young women wrote to her pastor these cheering words: ‘Your faithful preaching of God’s Word has done much for me in making the Lord Jesus very real to me. My heart is unspeakably grateful for his many blessings to me. I want to show my gratitude by a life of service. If you know of anyone who is strange and lonely, poor or neglected in any way, I should be glad to make friends with just such a one.’

“Have words ever been written that expressed more completely or impressively the spirit of Jesus of Nazareth, ‘who went about doing good’? Are they not in harmony with his character and mission as seen by the Prophet Isaiah a thousand years be-

fore his advent to earth: 'Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows'? What would be the effect on our world if all the members of our churches possessed this spirit?

"Jesus said to his disciples in Bethany: 'For ye have the poor always with you.' This is no less true in the twentieth century than it was in the first. Today in a peculiar sense the poor, the unfortunate, the lonely and the neglected are all about us. In multitudes of cases their condition is no fault of their own. How much sweeter would be the lives and richer the enjoyments of those who are blessed with this world's goods, if, instead of spending it lavishly for personal pleasure, they would personally plan to serve the vast army of the unemployed in these coming weeks!"

EVERYONE WHO TAKES A THOUGHTFUL VIEW OF LIFE HAS BEEN busy during recent long and weary months trying to find the cause of present distress and the way out of it. The whole situation is amazing—a world with more food and other needful things than it knows what to do with, and yet hunger, suffering, hopeless misery, and death universal in the midst of this very plenty. It seems a new phenomenon in history. How can it be? What is it doing to us now, and what will it do to our children? How can we escape the individual difficulties it brings? Can our present social structure withstand such a strain? Can it be possible that Christianity is a delusion, or is it simply that its followers have failed in themselves?

Mr. P. W. Wilson, writing in *Young Men* upon Man's Strange Paradox, first reviews the whole case of the present world, and then in these bold and solemn statements strikes the contrast between Christianity and its new and growing rival, Communism:

"The question is thus whether Jesus of Nazareth surpasses Karl Marx as a savior of society, and if so, in what respect. Is it possible to reconstruct the economic and political order of civilization in the light of and on the basis of the teachings of Jesus?

"Jesus did not announce a Five-Year Plan. The Christian gospel is not, like Communism, a race with time. It is an eternal evolution. When Our Lord's disciples asked Him for an immediate kingdom of heaven upon earth, He told them that times and

seasons were not their business. The transformation in the social order would be slow and sure, like the working of leaven in a barrel of meal.

"Already society has been greatly changed for the better. They who complain of evils, should remember to be grateful for the good. Compare the world today with what it was a hundred years ago, and we find that there has been a scarcely measurable advance in knowledge, health, athletics, comfort and pleasure. It is a simple fact that many of the unemployed themselves are better off today than many of the employed used to be, not so very long ago.

"Next, Jesus redeemed and preserved and enriched the personality which Communism sacrifices. He saved the soul of the individual and lifted it so far above the tyranny of circumstances that it could be at rest, even amid wrongs not yet righted. In the cabin on his plantation, the Negro, though a slave on earth, dwelt amid 'green pastures,' was companion with angels and, singing his 'spirituals,' became, like Moses, the friend of God. To be with Christ under the Capitalist was infinitely preferable, let us say, to St. Paul, than to be without Christ, whether in a Commune or anywhere else. Indeed, this is the reason why Communists describe the Christian gospel as 'the opiate of the people.' They cannot understand a faith that enables a man to be himself, even when he is down on his luck.

"If Jesus started his reconstruction of the social order by dealing with the individual, it was because the social order, however it be organized, consists of individuals. You cannot have taxes without taxgatherers and taxpayers. You cannot have wealth without the rich. You cannot have theft without thieves. You cannot have vice without sinners. You cannot have virtue without saints. That is why we can only improve the social order by educating the individual in the teachings of Jesus.

"The distinction between the Communist and the Christian is thus clear. Both wish to reconstruct the social order. But they go about it in opposite ways.

"The Communist takes society and concentrates all power in a few hands. Served by armies of spies and police as soldiers, he proceeds to impose his system on the people, whether they want it or not. Wherever the citizen goes, whatever he says, whatever he does, he is watched and terrorized.

"The Christian takes the system as it is but permeates it with a changed people. He does not concentrate power in a few hands. He invites every citizen, as a free man, to render willing

service to the commonwealth. He seeks to achieve his reforms by persuasion, and it is only as a last resort that he employs force. He brings producer and consumer together because he brings all people everywhere together. He promotes consumption and, therefore, production, because he wishes all mankind to live the more abundant life which Christ died to give us."

IT IS STRANGE THAT MEN FIND IT SO HARD TO LEARN THE USELESSNESS of going to extremes. Individuals are capable of acquiring discrimination and moderation, but collectively it is almost impossible for people to realize that extreme views defeat themselves and that extreme measures provoke reactions. History is tragically rich in evidences of the failure of harsh and drastic means taken to compel men to accept this or to give up that. Not only so, but persecution has a way of producing often the very opposite of the result sought, as Christian history shows.

It must not be complacently supposed that we have outgrown the sort of thinking that wants to enlist force of some kind in order to impose unwelcome ideas and ways upon men. We are simply in one of those periods of suspension of some historic social habit. If human society is capable of a bad practice at some time in its history, the mere fact that for some reason it abandoned it is no guarantee that it can never be resumed. We have been led to suppose that active religious persecution was a thing of the past in Western Europe and America, especially in these liberal-minded days; but what are we to think of its sudden reappearance, and that in Germany? No matter how little we may sympathize with atheism, we cannot deny an atheist's right to believe as he will without imperiling our own, and this editorial in *The Baptist* bring this fact home to us:

"That we suffer from a scourge of skepticism today few will deny. The cult of the godless is increasing and the propaganda of atheistic, agnostic and ungodly materialistic bodies is creating an atmosphere that is about as deadly as poison gas. Gradually the broadcast statements of cynical, pseudo-scientists have seeped into the public mind until there exists in many quarters a sad uncertainty and misgiving regarding the most fundamental spiritual realities. Somehow that mood must be met and the fog lifted but it is difficult to believe that there still are men in high

places who think that faith can be forced and agnosticism rooted out by threat of prosecution and punishment.

"Yet Edgar Ansel Mowrer, a responsible correspondent, writing from Berlin, says prosecuting attorneys throughout Germany have received instructions to proceed severely against atheists. Their processions and public demonstrations are to be forbidden and their organizations disbanded. Atheism is to be construed and punished as a crime. The news dispatch adds that, 'the leader of the anti-atheist campaign is the Roman Catholic Church, the church to which the chancellor Heinrich Bruening belongs. But Lutherans are not much behind the Catholics in this.' The head of the Krupp company, speaking recently before the National Association of German Industry, declared atheistic propaganda could not be too sharply opposed. On the other hand, Adolph Hitler, leader of the national socialists, seems equally determined that the Jews shall be silenced if not eliminated.

"It seems apropos and sufficient to quote Roger Williams: 'Enforced uniformity, sooner or later, is the greatest occasion of civil war, and persecution. . . . It is the will of God that . . . a permission of the most paganish, Jewish, Turkish, or anti-Christian consciences and worships be granted to all men in all nations and countries: and they are only to be fought against with that sword which is only in soul matters able to conquer, to wit, the sword of God's Spirit, the word of God.' That creed is in a desperate, indeed a hopeless plight which must be sustained by threat of fines or imprisonment. It is a serious thing thus to be brought face to face with the possibility that men may have to learn again in blood and tears what seemed to have been learned, once for all, in darker days, that the human conscience cannot be coerced."

ONE OF THE TEMPTATIONS OF THE PREACHER IS TO LEAN TOWARD the priestly side of his vocation rather than the prophetic. That is, it is easier to present the message of his faith in its more formal and undisputed aspects than to proclaim it with all its sternly aggressive and corrective demands. In a settled social order the former type of preacher easily settles into a somewhat humdrum existence, seeing that regular programs are regularly carried out, and that everything moves along properly and smoothly. It becomes ever more difficult for him to fight the good fight when

it comes to any clash between right and wrong. The prophetic ministry, on the other hand, is the one that accomplishes things and that leads the church constantly to higher ground and greater attainments. Dr. Halford Luccock, in a graduating address at Yale last year, gave this charge to preachers:

“Every generation of preachers is confronted with the same alternative—either to conform to the world like a chameleon, taking our protective coloring from prevailing standards and practices, or to transform the world. The first is by far the easiest. One never gets into ‘hot water’ by conformity. But, on the other hand, one never gets into the succession of the prophets without a baptism of ‘hot water.’ Indeed, the essential point about the apostolic baptism is not the amount of water, but its temperature. The priest is never in hot water; the prophet is never out of it. If you have any word for this time which is peculiarly the contribution of Jesus, sharp-edged and thoroughgoing, in God’s name say it.”

IT IS NOT ENOUGH FOR A PUBLIC SPEAKER TO HAVE A FINE COMMAND OF language, proper self-confidence, and good ideas. Even with these essentials he may be a failure. There is something else that one must possess if he is really going to reach his hearers. It might be called the audience sense. To use a popular formula, he must be audience conscious. How constantly we hear men who really have something to say, yet are so out of touch with their audiences that they utterly fail to impress them. They lack the sympathetic understanding of the crowd, so that it is left cold and unresponsive.

Some speakers, fully aware of the necessity of establishing a bond of understanding with an audience, go about it in the wrong way. They try to cajole it at the start by an appeal to its sense of humor, even though this may put people in the wrong mood for what is to follow. Humor has its place, but it is sometimes fatal to the desired effect of a speech that is introduced by it. The audience often senses a speaker more accurately than the speaker senses the audience, and so it quickly realizes when it is being wheedled into giving attention. It also discovers whether the speaker is giving his best or is more or less killing time. *The*

Congregationalist has repeated this comment by a college president respecting speakers before student audiences, but it might not be amiss if certain preachers would ponder what he says:

"The man they like best makes no pretense at entertaining them. He neither tells stories nor indulges in 'wise-cracks,' but he does prepare what he has to say very carefully. College young people are accustomed to taking down lectures point by point. They detect rather quickly whether a man has anything to say or not. Long experience has made them well acquainted with the art of dissolving thought in a thin solution of words, for they do that all the time themselves. They know too much about bluffing to be impressed by the bluffer. Curiously, many of the speakers who come before a college audience underestimate both the seriousness and the intelligence of the people who stand before them."

THERE IS DOUBTLESS CONSIDERABLE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DELIBERATELY teaching a child to disbelieve in God, as is done in Russia, and carelessly ignoring the subject, so that he grows up utterly indifferent to the divine claims. Many parents, anxious about their children's welfare in other directions, strangely fail here. There even seems to be in some cases a kind of shame about speaking faithfully of such things, as though one betrayed a weakness if he expressed faith in the Divine Being and a sense of obligation to Him. Then some parents suffer from the singular delusion that religious subjects cannot wisely be presented to a child till he is old enough to judge for himself, but just how he is to be prepared to judge without any training in the matter is not made clear. That such an attitude exists and is actively defended is evidenced by this item from *The Churchman*:

"The publishers Farrar and Rinehart were recently subjected to a brand-new sort of censorship. Several mothers objected to a picture of two children praying in *Peggy and Peter: What They Did Today*, a picture-book for children. They complained that they would have difficulty in explaining this picture to their own youngsters, who had never heard of God and religion, and believed that 'it might jeopardize the whole future happiness of a child to tell him that he is accountable to God for what he does and not to his own conscience.' The publishers deleted the offensive picture from the book. Instead of smiling at

the absurdity of this, we believe that religious teachers might well ask how far they are responsible for the attitude of these mothers, and to what extent they are cultivating in the minds of the children they teach notions of prayer that must very early be discarded, or which if retained will create the problems and grievances of those who continually resent the indifference of God to their personal desires."

IT IS A FINE THING IN THESE DAYS TO DISCOVER A HOPEFUL, CHEERFUL prospect anywhere. Yet they are to be found. Things have been exceedingly discouraging in the Christian world as well as in the social, political, and economic worlds. The salt of the earth in times like these are those courageous people who go right on doing their duty in the firm conviction that God has not abandoned man, and that, if we sow, we shall yet reap. There are Christian men and women all about us, thank Heaven, who are more concerned with the faithful performance of their duty, with the advancement of the Kingdom, with the glory of God, than they are in watching the financial weathervane.

We see this fine spirit in the rural church field, where, in the face of disheartening statistics and discouraging conditions, there are leaders of faith and intelligence who continue to study their own peculiar problems and to devise ways of meeting them, in the firm conviction that the rural church has a most important mission, and that it is entirely possible to fulfill it. And through their devoted Christian service conditions are actually changing for the better, hope is rising, and there is beginning to be substantial accomplishment. These paragraphs from an article in *The Baptist* by Edwin E. Sundt, upon A New Day for the Country Church, mark a change for the better and incidentally give us some valuable information:

"A decade ago the future of rural churches appeared exceedingly cheerless. Protestantism had closed 25,000 country churches since 1920 and out of the remaining 101,000 less than twenty per cent were reporting progress. Our 67,000 rural preachers were receiving an average stipend of \$1,029 per year, which actually meant that thousands labored for an income of considerably below \$1,000. With such salaries, there was little hope of attracting the type of leaders for which the new day

called. As revenues decreased, the temptation was to reduce the pastor's pay and this in turn forced the abler men to seek economic betterment in urban fields. Hence the continuous retreat."

"But this is what is actually happening. Since 1925 over one hundred larger parishes have been organized. This means a new type of religious cooperation. Rather than abandon denominational loyalties which still constitute a power in rural centers, we have learned to cooperate without surrendering the inalienable rights of local churches. There are, in some larger parishes, as many as fifteen smaller churches combined for service, rather than any attempt to eliminate valuable loyalties. By pooling funds a higher grade of leadership is secured and men with proper vision, consecration and training are creating life-centered programs. In these parishes salaries average \$2,000 or better and when fifteen or, as is usually the case, only five churches combine under the leadership of two or three vigorous leaders, the result has been uniformly amazing. The larger parish plan brings a new romance into rural fields and promises unlimited results."

IN CASE OF A SERIOUS DISTURBANCE OF HEALTH THE FIRST THING to do is to face the actual facts, and not try to explain them away. This is just as true in things other than physical health. It is true with respect to the church and religious matters generally. Whatever of hope the statisticians have to offer, the church has at present a waning influence upon the lives of individuals and upon the public mind. This does not amount to a prophecy that things are not going to improve; it simply means that we may as well face the facts as they stand today. Disturbing as these facts may be, when we actually arrive at them there is a feeling that we at least know where we are and so can shape a definite course. The *Watchman-Examiner* has very frankly stated the case respecting the decline in church attendance, and the cause, in this editorial, which should suggest some vigorous sermons:

"Beyond a doubt church attendance is falling off. Just before he died Colonel Sellers, who had charge of the *Brooklyn Eagle* sermon page, in answer to an inquiry from us said: 'I should say that in Brooklyn as a whole the church attendance is about sixty per cent of what it was twenty-five years ago. In the

meantime the city has greatly increased its population.' On the other hand, the horde that has been pouring into the city is not made up of church-going people, and many of the old church goers have moved to the suburbs. In some places the church attendance has increased, but broadly speaking, there will not be disagreement about the general decrease. The real explanation is that a majority of the people are not interested in religious things. It is all nonsense to say that the people who do not go to church are more religious than those who do. It is all nonsense to say that people stay away from church because they find too many hypocrites there when they go. It is all nonsense to say that the preaching is so poor that it does not attract thinking people. The truth is they have lost a taste for God. They love their automobiles, their golf courses, the visiting of their friends, the lie-a-bed and the Sunday newspaper opportunity. Let not this discourage us. Let us do our best and leave the results with God."

IN THIS TIME OF STRONG AND PERSISTENT EFFORTS FOR CHURCH union there are still those who seriously question the advisability of a single great evangelical body. Individual beliefs and preferences cannot be lightly brushed aside, and there might easily be too much compromise in matters of doctrine to give a single great church a sufficient theology. Then, it has often been pointed out, not without reason, that a certain element of competition is healthful, since it stimulates more careful attention to the great essentials for which all the churches stand, and also promotes a certain striving to excel in good works. This item in *The Lutheran* is not inclined, however, to place too much value on the factor of competition:

"The number of churches in the state of Vermont has decreased and likewise the number of adult church members has decreased. Says the *New York Times*: 'There are only forty-two communities of less than 5,000 population remaining in Vermont in which there is now competition among three denominations.' The same paper further states: 'And yet the adult church membership of Vermont is smaller in proportion to the total population than in the ratio for the country as a whole' and 'in the absence of special sectarian drives it may be that the emphasis on numbers is not so great as once it was.'

"At first sight one might infer that in the day of over-

emphasis upon merger in business and church circles we have lost sight of the truth of that old slogan: 'Competition is the life of trade.' But keener study leads one to conclude that the Gospel in its simplicity and directness has been diluted to mere humanitarianism and sociological theories."

THE CHURCH IS JUDGED FROM VARIOUS ASPECTS OF ITS LIFE AND activity. One way of judging the conscience of the church is by its care of its ministry. There have been few periods in history in which careers of so many kinds have invited the interest and activity of ambitious youth as in the past thirty or forty years. Science and industry have combined to create occupations that were unknown in the days of our fathers. It is true that in more recent years the professions and higher occupations have become crowded, and that this is especially true in these days of unfavorable economic conditions; yet, even so, most of them are still far more attractive, even for the single standpoint of financial returns, than is the Christian ministry.

Now, probably no loyal and intelligent pastor would himself say that the average ministerial income ought to be larger than the average income of successful men in secular professions and occupations. It should not be such that young men would be tempted to enter the ministry for the sake of the loaves and fishes. Human nature is weak, and it is easy to discover a Providential "call" to any profession that offers fine emoluments. But this does not justify the idea that the Christian preacher should continually suffer from lack of money. If he is fit to hold his place, then he deserves enough to enable him to provide for his family and to meet all proper obligations, so that he may maintain his own self-respect and the respect and confidence of the community.

There is also another side of this matter of ministerial support, and that concerns provision for old age. It is absurd to expect the average preacher to lay up enough to ensure the most meager support for the years of retirement. Some other provision must be made, and the church must make it. Any faithful pastor deserves more than his salary, often not only small but

irregularly paid; he certainly deserves the reasonable assurance that the denomination to which he has given his years and strength shall assure comfort of body and peace of mind in his old age. Writing in *The Congregationalist* upon ministers' incomes Dr. Charles R. Brown has recently said:

"The ministry at its best is not a money-making profession. Whenever you find a wealthy minister, you know at once that it is either patrimony or matrimony. He either inherited it or he married it—he never earned it in his profession. My own salary for the first year of my ministry was a thousand dollars, with the privilege of living in a portion of the parsonage, as I was then unmarried. For the second year it was \$1,100 and for the third year, \$1,200. These annual increases were encouraging, but they were not sufficiently large and dazzling to make me financially reckless.

"When the Interchurch Movement made its survey a few years ago, it found that in only ten states did the salaries of the Protestant pastors average more than \$1,000 a year. In thirty-two states the average salary ranged from \$700 to \$1,000 a year. In six states—Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Arkansas—the average was below seven hundred. It will be noticed that these six states are all in the South, where there are many Negro churches made up for the most part of people who are poor. The large cities in the ten states—Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa and California—brought up the general average of the pastor's salary.

"In a more recent year, the returns for income tax showed that one lawyer in every five paid his tax on an income exceeding \$3,000, one doctor in every seven, one engineer in every ten, and one minister in every hundred. All this indicates that the average minister's salary is much lower than that which is received in the other 'learned professions.' "

IT MIGHT WELL BE A VERY PROFITABLE SPIRITUAL EXERCISE TO trace in history instances of the fulfilment of Paul's words, "and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty." Historical forces sometimes work in obscurity, and apparently so ineffectively that they wait long for their proper appraisal. Indeed it is quite likely that certain great trends in history have been largely, if not entirely, given

their direction by acts and words that have remained unrecognized.

All this is as true in the religious world as in the social and political. As an existing example, we may take the case of French Protestantism. How much do you hear of it or read about it? There is in fact comparatively little said or written concerning this section of the Protestant church. The British chaplain at Bordeaux, Rev. C. H. D. Grimes, has recently contributed to *The Modern Churchman* an article setting forth its recent history and present state, and at the outset speaks of the meager information that even French Protestants themselves were able to give him. The principal facts that he presents give us a picture of the Protestant group, equal in numbers to only about one-fortieth of the population of France and hindered by its own internal divisions. That is, we find a small and divided church facing the great, well organized Roman Catholic Church. So serious is the factional element in the situation that of late Protestant leaders have come to realize the vital necessity of co-operation, and a Protestant Federation of France has been formed, though old prejudices are greatly retarding progress.

The whole picture which Chaplain Grimes presents is gloomy enough, yet this closing paragraph justifies the existence of this struggling group and incidentally gives Protestantism elsewhere, and the Christian church as opposed to the world, a vitally important suggestion:

"A leading writer on Protestantism admits that in the religious awakening which has spread through France since the War, the chief credit must go to the Roman Church. But he claims that the Protestants, although a small minority, have played their part effectively, if only by compelling the Roman Church to stimulate personal piety, to eliminate abuses and superstitions, and to bring the Bible into greater prominence. He rightly remarks that the Roman Church in France is something very different from what it is in Spain, and that even in Brittany, where there is scarcely any Protestantism, it is different to what it is in La Drôme, where Protestantism is strong. Here we have perhaps the most important rôle that Protestantism can play in France, though by no means the only rôle, for there are un-

doubtedly those who find in its simplicity, its freedom and its search after intellectual truth, their only spiritual home."

HOPE, VISION, AMBITION, ARE INDISPENSABLE IN THEIR PLACES, but it is impossible to base upon them any estimates of permanent values. One must look backward, and not forward, for these. Important facts may be recovered from shattered dreams. It is also true that ambitions realized enable one to appraise at their relative importance the factors that have entered into success. Now, what are the things that make a college education valuable to the man who, having caught the idea that such an experience would mean much in later years, pays the price in time, work, and money to secure it? After he has tested it all by applying it to life in his more mature years he should be able to give important testimony.

In an article on The Cultural College, published in *Christian Education*, Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary of The Council of Church Boards of Education, gives this judgment by a certain group of alumni respecting the things that made their college course worth while:

"A small Eastern college for men has just had a referendum by its graduates on the worth-while elements in their education. More than a thousand out of 1800 living graduates participated in the referendum. All but 1.5 per cent of them are employed. Only 3 per cent are divorced out of a total of 93.5 per cent married. Eight hundred of them have remained in the same type of business or profession since leaving college. Forty per cent of those in business hold executive positions. Considerable stability here.

"They place on the credit side of their college experiences broad intellectual interests, ability to reason and analyze facts, solid and sane foundations in religion and morality, ability to express and communicate thought, and interest in and appreciation of beautiful things. The college has given ability to get along with others, coordination, poise, self-reliance, self-confidence, ideals, friendships. Of their college studies, by a large plurality, English has been most valuable, both in the cultural and vocational lines, followed by philosophy, history and French. As to the improvement of the college, they suggest more of the human and artistic phases. In the classroom there should be

more offerings fitting for politics and public life and the fine arts. On the campus more effort should be made to counteract 'the universal lack of courtesy, manners and breeding existing today.' There should be better food and better conversation."

EDUCATION IS USUALLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE YOUNG SINCE IT IS with them that its hopes of success must chiefly rest. Still, people of more advanced years have their own claims to consideration. While their minds are not so receptive and plastic as those of children and young people, they nevertheless have a deeper appreciation of the importance of education than the younger generation can have, and they have a wisdom of wider experience and longer observation to enable them to interpret and value more correctly any new knowledge they may acquire. It is therefore quite right that a good bit of attention should be given to the educational needs of adults, as is now beginning to be done.

All this applies to religious education. What proportion of our adult church members are able to give a clear account of their faith, even in its general aspects? The church very greatly needs to give more knowledge and guidance to large numbers of its older members. This item, from *The Christian Advocate*, sets forth the matter quite concisely, and its first paragraph may be surprising to many readers:

"Our Jewish friends have given us a good lead. In the city of Brooklyn, New York, they have recently founded 'an Academy for Adult Jewish Education which will teach the New Testament as well as the Old,' and use the approved methods of modern scholarship for the purpose.

"It is announced that following a week-day schedule 'classes will be conducted without lectures by the seminar method.' For this work the pulpit is to give way to the classroom.

"One of the promoters of the undertaking is reported to have said that 'religious educators have been concentrating too long on the education of children' and that all too little attention has been given to the religious needs of adults, assailed by doubt and skepticisms as they so often are.

"Problems of spiritual readjustment are not confined to any one group of persons nor to any one faith. They are sharp and often overwhelming in their pressure upon the minds of thinking

people for whom the easy solution of life's care-free years is no longer significant.

"Something more than sermons, something more than average Bible-class study is required if the faith and hope of men are to be sustained in the bitter conflicts and hopeless contradictions of daily experience.

"There is a widespread interest in adult education. In many instances this goes far beyond a desire for better training and skill for the work of making a living.

"Many adults in our churches are eagerly seeking help in making difficult spiritual adjustments to modern life. They believe, and with good reason, that religion holds the key to their perplexities. But they will not find what they seek unless others share with them the insights of knowledge and living faith.

"We shall be slow to recognize one of the greatest opportunities of the time if we neglect the adults of our churches as we carry forward the work of religious education. We shall be pitifully ignorant of what is going on in the minds of many seekers for the truth if we assume that the average adult Bible class is meeting the need."

JUST HOW FAR IS THE CHURCH RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCIAL CONDITIONS? Surely, in the light of New Testament teaching and also according to the words of our Lord Himself, even the most faithful preaching and the most consistent living are not going to convert everyone, nor the majority, nor even a very numerous minority. Why, then, try to fix upon the church any responsibility for things as they are? But we must remember that there is a distinction to be made between, on the one hand, winning everyone to our view on everything, and, on the other, having a deterrent and wholesome influence upon people who do not entirely agree with us. After all, the one outstanding duty of the church is to bear witness to the truth, not to compel acceptance of it.

But though a Christian may not bring his neighbors to believe as he does, this fact does not release him from the obligation to do his part and use his influence as a Christian citizen. Certainly no year for a long time has more seriously demanded of him his utmost in faith and prayer and testimony for the right as does this present year, 1932. *The United Presbyterian*, in

pointing out the peril found in our indifferent and neglectful citizenship, makes this statement which might very well serve as a basis for some good patriotic preaching this year:

"The greatest peril of our day is not the 'Red' menace. It is not the low price of wheat or high price of gasoline; it is much graver than these. It is a peril that becomes more and more threatening as times goes on, and the problems of government become more complex. It is a peril that is immeasurably greater in representative government than in a monarchy. The supreme American peril is the failure of the Christian citizen to participate actively in political affairs. It reaches its climax in their failure to vote. This menace, ominous as it is, is regarded lightly by multitudes of Christian citizens. The very group to which the nation looks for its protection from evil people and evil forces is the group we speak of as respectable citizens. Through every political unit of the nation runs this poison of indifference to civic duties. Through the municipality, the county, the state and the nation it flows like a devastating gulf stream. Very small minorities control important elections, and determine the questions most vital to the public welfare, because Christian citizens are too indifferent or too lazy to take the trouble to cast their votes for good men and safe measures. Thus the most responsible element in American citizenry is deaf to the manifest call of God's kingdom. This land must be rescued from the peril of non-voting citizens. This indifference is the greatest American peril. It hangs menacingly over the land—a sword of Damocles.

"From a leaflet entitled, 'The Importance of One Vote,' put out by the New York Civic League, we quote the following: 'A little over a thousand votes in New York State in 1884 decided whether Blaine or Cleveland should be President. Less than a thousand votes at a State Prohibition election in 1903 decided for more than a dozen years, whether Vermont should be a wet or a dry State and it went wet because several thousand temperance people failed to vote. Sometimes good legislators are elected or defeated by one vote.

"One vote decided the election of Governor Morton of Massachusetts in 1839, thus defeating Edward Everett, the famous orator, statesman and scholar. One vote gave Texas to the United States. One vote brought on the Mexican War. One vote made California a part of the Union, and thus turned the tide of immigration westward. One vote elected Oliver Cromwell to the famous 'Long Parliament' and sent Charles I to the scaffold, revolutionized England and made Great Britain free."

FOR YEARS MANY AMERICANS THOUGHT OF COMMUNISM, WHEN they thought of it at all, as a remote thing, a theory that might produce occasional disturbances in the Old World, but too fantastic and visionary to last even there. Since the Russian Revolution, however, we have begun to consider it more thoughtfully, even seriously. We are coming to realize that Communism finds its great recruiting ground among the hungry, the poverty-stricken, the ill-used, and the unemployed. Unfortunately conditions with us for the past two years have enormously added to the ranks of such men, so that many of them will grasp desperately at anything that seems to offer any way, however radical, to escape the social and economic ills from which they suffer. Sick people who have not secured from their regular physicians the relief they hoped for frequently become the prey of quacks and the purchasers of valueless, even poisonous, nostrums. The same psychology applies to the social structure.

The best remedy for Communism is not argument or suppression, but an intelligent and determined effort of all classes of people to work and sacrifice together for better conditions. A letter in *The Christian Advocate*, written from Russia by its Chicago editor, Dan B. Brunmitt, contains this passage which emphasizes the importance of removing causes of unrest and suffering in order to forestall the spread of Communism among us:

"I find some people still surprised that the rulers of Russia have held on to their power so long. But what is there strange about it, that a people so utterly crushed by war and famine as was Russia a dozen years ago should listen to men who promised—and went at it to provide—these things?

"The whole gospel of Marx is addressed, first of all, to the man who lacks, who has nothing. It has little charm to the man who owns something and can hope to hold on to it; unless, of course, he is sensitive enough to detect even in communism some faint throb of the same compassion for the multitude which moved in the heart of One greater than Marx.

"So, as a device to make trouble, communism has nothing to say to the majority of Americans, and can get no response from them. They are not now homeless, not now outcast, not now help-

less in the grip of a greedy state-plus-church autocracy, not now despairing of any improvement in their lot.

"So long as all this stays true, communism can get no foothold here. But even now it is not completely true. We have Americans who—no blame to them—*are* hungry, homeless, helpless, and hopeless.

"If these are left to their fate, and we do nothing; if we see their numbers increasing, and we do nothing—why should we be shocked if they look to men who at least promise them a new world?

"I have seen plenty of Russian propaganda stuff, and heard it, too. It is sometimes funny, sometimes pathetic, sometimes deeply tragic. But I know that such propaganda is wholly impotent of itself to convert any considerable group of Americans.

"Even the most ardent Russian preachers of communism, socialism, Marxianism admit that all they can do will be unavailing to produce any great results. They do say, however, and, I believe, with truth, that America is playing into their hands in the measure that it does not prevent the creation of a great exploited and sullenly resentful class, alongside a much smaller class whose wealth has come from privilege and from the labor of the crowd."

IN THE DAYS OF OUR FATHERS THE THEATER WAS HELD AS TABOO by most of our evangelical Christians because of its subversive moral influence. But it is probably true that in those days any theater that the police would permit to stay open did not compare to many of our present moving pictures in evil suggestion. The very physical possibilities of the film permit the portrayal of things that were impossible for the old theater with its limited stage and facilities. This, with modern easy ideas as to propriety, encourages the display of pictures that would have provoked riots a half-century ago. Not only is this true, but the modern picture houses draw a good part of their patronage from among our church members.

Not only are the moving pictures, as they are conducted today, a powerful incentive to crime and immorality, but of late they have been found to be detrimental with respect to our national reputation among foreign peoples. Overdrawn and sensational American pictures inevitably leave the impression

upon average audiences abroad that they are getting an idea of the usual American life. The *Federal Council Bulletin* gives some striking evidence of the way such films are regarded in Japan, and this, with the *Bulletin's* straightforward comments, are given here:

"As for the effect of motion pictures in the countries of the Orient, the National Christian Council of Japan—the body which coordinates the Christian work of the Empire—expressed the generally accepted view when it wrote to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America not long ago, entreating the churches of our land to take every step possible to prevent the continued influx of undesirable American films into Japan. The chief censor of the Tokyo police—a non-Christian—was quoted as declaring that many of the American films were highly detrimental to the morals of the Japanese. For us to be eager to send Christian missionaries to the Orient and to be indifferent to the sending of films that break down the influence of the missionary is certainly an anomaly.

"An editorial in a daily newspaper, commenting on the report of the Federal Council's Research Department on the public relations of the motion picture industry, took the Council to task for its alleged view that every motion picture should be an 'animated Sunday school lesson.' This, of course, is a caricature. Nobody is saying that motion pictures should become moral homilies or pedagogical instruments. Every sensible person recognizes that the motion picture is primarily a form of entertainment. But that only raises the question as to whether an industry which claims a great part of the leisure time of children and youth is going to furnish entertainment that is wholesome or entertainment that is demoralizing.

"Another newspaper protests that the churches must realize that the motion picture is 'not a philanthropy but a business conducted for legitimate profit.' That, too, one readily grants. But it only raises the question as to whether the industry is utterly callous as to how it makes its profit. Producing milk is a business, not a philanthropy, but that is no excuse for permitting dairymen to furnish milk that is infected or filthy.

"Meeting the motion picture industry on its own ground, we wonder whether its leaders can never be made to realize that in the long run it would be 'good business' to offer films that have a wider and more enduring appeal than much of the present banal

product. We hear that the income at the motion picture box offices is declining. We suspect that one reason is simply that the public is at last becoming tired of entertainment which has no more imagination than is involved in a constant exploitation of sex, gangsters, night-life and an unreal sentimentality."

IN THE PRESENCE OF SOME OUTRAGEOUS CRIME IT IS DIFFICULT for men to keep their heads—even men normally on the side of law and order, and as a result we have "lynch law." But this is an evil, even if its victim deserves death, for it is a definite step toward the breakdown of law, a step toward government by inflamed emotions, instead of by deliberate and fair judgment acting upon established principles. Moreover, there is not only a chance that the mob may commit a fatal mistake and kill the wrong man, but actually in a large percentage of lynching cases an innocent man does pay the penalty for a crime committed by some scoundrel who escapes. *The Baptist* made this editorial comment upon the findings of the Southern Commission on the Study of Lynching, and the sentiments expressed should be echoed by the press generally:

"The last shred of camouflage has been stripped from that short and summary method of administering justice denominated 'lynching' which is so popular in some parts of the country, by the recent report of the Southern Commission on the Study of Lynching. More than half the victims of the mob are probably innocent of the crimes for which they are done to death. Fewer than one-fourth of the persons lynched since 1890 have been accused of assaults upon white women. It is not true that lynchings are necessary because courts do not convict Negroes for their crimes. It is not true that the reason that mob leaders are so seldom indicted is that they can not be identified. They can easily be identified if there is any desire to do so. The more ignorant a community is the more likely it is that lynchings will occur. The excuses which are advanced from time to time for this despicable practice of lynching are torn to shreds by this report. There is no excuse for it ever. It is the resort of cowards and morons and a disgrace to any community in which it occurs. The real cause of lynching is race prejudice, and here it is revealed in all its dark ugliness and ignorance. Let us not listen to any more special pleading and specious excuse."

BOOKS

THE WORD AND THE WORLD ¹

THE LITERATURE on the Barthian school of theology available to the English reader is steadily increasing. This book is the result of an invitation given to Professor Brunner last year to deliver a series of lectures at the University of London. As might be expected, it contains nothing essentially new, but it will be welcomed as an exposition, the more so as it makes clear some points about which there has been divergence of opinion.

In the first chapter Brunner discusses his relation to philosophy. He is not opposed to it; on the contrary he is strongly interested in it. (P. 14 f.) But philosophy can afford no Christian certainty. Its authority begins and ends in the human mind; it affords knowledge of man, but not knowledge of God. Knowledge of God comes only through His revelation of Himself. Christian faith is "knowledge of God from beyond all human possibilities—truth which is given in the event which constitutes revelation, in the unique decisive occurrence of history, in the Word of God" (p. 16). The Christian knowledge of God has therefore a different source from that of philosophy, and it has a different content. (P. 17.) Take, for example, the idea of God which is arrived at by processes of thought. This represents Him as the world-cause or the world-ground. The Christian idea of God the Creator is entirely different.

"The Creator is the Lord of the world and of myself, the sovereign self who needs no world in order to exist. He is the One in whose will the world has its ground; the One who for this reason *cannot* be known from the world, but only out of His Word. These three belong inseparably together: the Word of God, the personal Lord, the Creator." (P. 26.)

Another point of distinction is that philosophical world views seek to be demonstrated along lines of reason. The philosopher is

¹ *The Word and the World.* By Emil Brunner, Professor of Theology, University of Zurich. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1931. Pp. 127.

constantly looking for universal and necessary truths, but "to prove faith would mean placing faith within the sphere of general truths; and that is evidently nonsense, for it contradicts the definition of faith" (p. 27). This does not involve that the Christian despises reason. He acknowledges it as the greatest gift of the Creator, "but that is as a gift and not as God. . . . Reason is not given us to know God, but to know the world."

It will be seen, then, that Brunner believes whole-heartedly in the Deity of Christ and in the supreme revelation of God in Christ. For Christianity is a unique religion. No other religion maintains that its prophet is "the incarnate Word of God. They believe in the teaching of Zarathustra or Mohammed, but they do not believe in *them*. That Buddha did not take any such place in early Buddhism is a matter of course for every one who is aware that early Buddhism has no God." (P. 36.) He continues, "Jesus the Christ means eternity in time, the Absolute within relativity, the fulfilment of time, the beginning of that which is beyond all temporal change, the *aion mellon*, the coming world of God and salvation" (p. 36 f.). He points out how other conceptions have come into prominence, such as that Jesus is the teacher, the example, or the symbol of the divine. "They are all futile, because here is an absolute either—or: *either* Jesus is merely human, and then He has no importance for faith; *or* He has importance for faith, and then He is the stumbling-block" (p. 41).

No Fundamentalist could desire a clearer statement than that made by Brunner in regard to the Deity of our Lord. He is the eternal Word, who spoke through the prophets and who became incarnate in history. But how is the eternal Word related to the divine word in the Bible? In discussing this question in chapter iv Brunner chooses as his text John 5:39, "Search the scriptures." The fact that we are told to search shows that what we describe is not given immediately without enquiry. To explain his view Brunner takes the analogy of seeking for gold. "For real faith in the Bible, such as we find in the Reformers, the Bible is like a certain area of ground in which you can find gold; now, go and search it! But orthodoxy declares: All the ground

is gold, ground and gold are identical; you need not search, you have it as a convenient possession." (P. 94 f.) The only thing to remember is that there is one difference between the gold seeker and the Bible enquirer; "The gold-seeker knows beforehand what gold is; he who looks for God's Word in the Bible does not know it beforehand" (p. 95).

In stating this view Brunner believes he is following in the footsteps of Luther and Calvin. The Reformers, he says, "never tire of making clear the distinction between a false blind Scripture authority—this suicidal idolatrous obedience, this faith in advance—on the one hand, and that which they called *autopistia*, i.e., one's own hearing, one's own conviction of God speaking in the Scripture. . . . Later on this Reformation view of the Bible was often confused with the orthodox view, although in point of fact we have to choose between them. The orthodox teachers could never have repeated Luther's words, that 'the Scriptures are the crib wherein Christ is laid'; and Luther would never have approved of the opinion of later orthodoxy that everything in the Scriptures, just because it *is* in the Scriptures, is equally inspired by the Holy Spirit. For Luther and Calvin, those living exegetes, it was clear that the Scriptures are human testimony to divine truth." (P. 93 f.)

Whether this is an accurate representation of the views of the Reformers is open to question. Certainly it is doubtful if they regarded the Bible as containing many "errors and inaccuracies." Brunner, however, has no hesitation about making this affirmation (p. 96), and he adds that "the Bible is full of that frailty and fallibility which is characteristic of all that is human." The Bible in his view is the earthen vessel designed by God to become the receptacle of peculiar contents.

But how are we to distinguish those contents from the human element? Brunner's answer seems to be twofold. In the first place, divine truth carries its own conviction. Our business is to proclaim the Word; it will do its own work on the receptive mind. Secondly, there is the work of the Holy Spirit. When writing on Barthian views in the issue of *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW* for October, 1931, I discussed Zerbe's idea, that Barth postulates a transcen-

dental faith as a basis of religion and revelation, and suggested that Brunner's meaning was more in accord with the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit. (P. 624.) In chapter iii of these lectures Brunner enters into the question in considerable detail, and makes it clear that this is so.

"Have I a criterion by which to determine what can and what cannot be God's Word? May I pass judgment upon God's Word? In the New Testament this question is answered just as unambiguously as the question of the meaning of God's Word. . . . He testifies to the truth of the Gospel through the Holy Spirit. This the old theologians called the *testimonium spiritus sancti internum*." (P. 63.)

It will be seen then that the position of Brunner combines elements of traditional theology with great freedom in interpretation of the Scriptures. It will be interesting to note the reaction of American thought to views which are opposed to Modernism and Fundamentalism alike. In some respects Brunner is a Protestant Loisy. Loisy is a radical critic, and yet a believer, finding room for faith in the infallibility of the church. Brunner also allows radical criticism, but turns for assurance to the divine Word in the Bible, which is made clear to the individual by the work of the Holy Spirit. For one thing at least we may be grateful, that Brunner makes his meaning clear. Truly we are put to the crisis. It is a question of "either—or," and the Barthians would press the issue, believing that they represent truly the position of the church of the Reformation.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

INDIA'S RELIGION OF GRACE AND CHRISTIANITY ²

WHEN THE AVERAGE man thinks of India's religion he has in mind the teaching of the Vedas. But the Vedanta religion, whose prevailing idea is that God is all and that all that exists is God—a religion of pure non-duality wherein salvation means realizing

² *India's Religion of Grace and Christianity Compared and Contrasted*. By Rudolf Otto, Marburg, author of *The Idea of the Holy*, etc. Translated by Frank Hugh Foster, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 144. Appendices and Glossary of Sanscrit Terms.

the identity of the human soul with the All-soul—is by no means the only notable Hindu religion. There is also the Bhakti religion with its personal God, Isvara, with its possibility of intercommunion between the worshiper and God, and with a soteriology involving the element of free, unmerited favor. Dr. Rudolph Otto, of Marburg, has described this religion in his volume, *India's Religion of Grace and Christianity Compared and Contrasted*.

Only a moderate amount of research has been done in the field of the Bhakti religion. But much impetus was given to such research by the studies of Dr. J. N. Farquhar some years ago. Dr. Otto, whose *Idea of the Holy* and whose other works on India have given him a high place among theological authorities, has furnished a fresh, scholarly, and convincing treatment of this somewhat unexplored field, and his book will surprise many who are unfamiliar with the subject.

He shows that questions concerning salvation and redemption "have not been put and answered only in Palestine; but, as it would appear, exactly the same conceptions play the same part in the religion and theological speculations of India!" (P. 12.) The first chapter is entitled A Competitor of Christianity, and it states that "there seems to have arisen in India a competitor of almost astonishing similarity—a competitor which seems to dispute the sole possession by Christianity of that which is its very heart—first, the salvation which comes not from profound speculation and for the wise, but is offered to all, and to the 'poor in spirit' in particular; secondly, the salvation which comes not by mystic experiences, by the loss of personality in the impersonal primal cause of all being, but by bhakti, that is by surrender in simple, trusting appropriation of the 'grace' of the 'Lord,' and in love to him" (p. 17 f.).

The ruling conceptions of the Bhakti religion have not only deeply affected the older and more widespread expressions of Hinduism, but have also influenced some of the sects of Buddhism. When Xavier arrived in Japan he was surprised to meet there what he called the "Lutheran heresy," meaning, of course, the teachings of "grace." This doctrine is emphasized in the strong-

est school of Japanese Buddhism today. Illustrating this situation, the author refers to a conversation he once had with a young Japanese Buddhist votary of the sect affected by the idea of bhakti, during which he noted with surprise what excellent German he spoke. The young student replied: "Our teacher told me that there was once a Shinran in Germany too, who proclaimed salvation by grace alone, without one's own works, by the name of Martin Luther. So I determined to learn German in order to get acquainted with the Shinran of the West in his own language." (P. 20.)

In the second chapter, A Struggle for God, the author recites the history of the origin and development of the Bhakti faith, centering his attention especially upon the unfolding of spiritual and theological elements in the experience of the outstanding seer of Bhakti, Ramanuja. Sankara, the greatest representative of the "mysticism of India" in the school of Hinduism which we ordinarily associate with that land because it does really stand in the forefront of Indian thinking and feeling, had come forward three centuries before Ramanuja. His school at the latter's time had crowded all other schools into the background. Ramanuja was not concerned so much with philosophy or speculation, as "with the defence of a *religious* possession." (P. 31.) He had to wage his battle for a personal God. He was chiefly a theologian. He had to fight "against those who stood upon the same traditional ground as himself, on the ground of the *Vedanta*, but explained the old tradition of the Upanishads in conformity with the doctrine of *maya*" (p. 31), *i.e.*, a teaching that there is only one single, genuine reality and existence, and that it is without a second, and that what we fancy to be real is only illusion, with all the inferences from such concepts, leading to an idea of salvation by identity with one terrific, absorbing Unity. (P. 32.)

As over against such a god, whose existence might be expressed in the phrase, a passionless ocean, Ramanuja asserted the existence of Isvara, a personal God, who has qualities, is merciful, bestows grace, saves, and can be served and loved. His theism is somewhat comparable to a high Calvinism.

The author has an interesting chapter on the soteriology of

Bhakti, under the title, *The Question Regarding Salvation*. At the end of this discussion he lists eighteen chief differences between two sects of the Bhakti religion, the northern and southern, concerning vexed matters of grace which have been discussed by Christian theologians for ages. But one or two samples can be given, the first and the last:

“The North says:

‘The divine grace is “earned” (viz., by one’s own qualities, *e.g.*, bhakti, which man has to have).

“The South says in reply:

‘Grace has “no price.” It is free, and is also “irresistible.”’

“The North:

‘Now then: The grace of God at least expects the surrender of the self to God.’

“The South:

‘That would be no surrender but a bargaining.—Rather, God accepts out of his own free will, unasked and uncompelled.’” (P. 56 ff.)

The most important contribution of the book is found in the chapter which discusses *The Relation of Christianity to the Bhakti-Religion*. The author finds a far-going agreement between the two religions regarding single religious ideas, *e.g.*, incarnation, grace, election, etc. But he declares that “in spite of all analogies, the religion of India turns upon an altogether different axis from the religion of the Bible” (p. 65). He speaks also of the profound difference of “spirit” and “atmosphere.” (Pp. 66, 100.) He does not believe a sincere disciple of Bhakti and a sincere Christian could recite even the Lord’s prayer together. Isvara and the Christian God are shown to be radically different in their attitude toward the world. (P. 70.)

Many other differences are noted, but the chief one is found in Christ’s role as a propitiator. “Isvara also ‘forgives,’ and men seek forgiveness from him. But his forgiveness is an *overlooking* of the fault . . . not, however, the Christian ‘forgiveness,’ with its far more profound and even almost mysterious sound.” (P. 106.) The author’s position regarding expiation and satisfac-

tion will appeal to those who do not conceive of God as merely a "private" being, but one in whom the whole ethical structure of the universe inheres. "God cannot relax, except this relaxation is at the same time an 'expiation'" (p. 107). "India has no 'expiator,' no Golgotha, and no Cross" (p. 108).

Dr. Otto's book will be found valuable not only for the Indologist, but for the missionary and for Hindus who are studying the likeness between their faith and ours. It is written in all candor, and its irenic spirit will insure it the most careful consideration by disciples both of Sankara and Ramanuja.

FREDERICK W. LEWIS.

SCIENCE & RELIGION ³

THE CLAIM OF CHRISTIANITY is that it is sufficiently vital to assimilate all truths. Those who are persuaded of this proposition have no fear of science. They may be disturbed by pseudo science, and they may oppose the undemonstrated claims of those who call themselves scientists, but they necessarily welcome the truth. While this is true, intelligent men and women are torn in their allegiance to science and religion. To many it is either or, when it should be both and, for science and religion are both in a quest for truth.

The project of bringing together in symposium the recognized representatives of scientific thinking and religious leadership was wisely conceived and successfully consummated. The twelve addresses included in this book constitute a series broadcast in Great Britain in 1930, from September to December. Their purpose was to give a "personal interpretation of the relation of science to religion . . . and to determine . . . to what degree the conclusions of modern science affect religious

³ *Science & Religion: A Symposium.* With a Foreword by Michael Pupin. Contributions by Professor Julian Huxley; Professor Sir J. Arthur Thomson; Professor J. S. Haldane; The Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham; Professor B. Malinowski; The Very Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, Dean of Canterbury; The Rev. Canon B. H. Streeter; The Rev. C. W. O'Hara, S. J.; Professor Sir Arthur S. Eddington; Professor S. Alexander; The Very Rev. W. R. Inge, Dean of St. Paul's; Dr. L. P. Jacks. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1931. Pp. xii + 175. Index.

dogma." Such a symposium could hardly fail to interest all who are in earnest about religion.

It is noteworthy that all of the twelve speakers are well and widely known. They are not only specialists in their several departments, but masters of English prose writing. Their material is carefully organized, and it is a joy to read a book written in such transparent and forceful style.

The list of the names of these writers is impressive in itself. The scientists are Julian Huxley, grandson of Thomas Huxley and Professor of Zoology; Sir J. Arthur Thomson, biologist and author of *The Outline of Science*; Professor J. S. Haldane, the author of *Mechanism Life and Personality*; Dr. B. Malinowski, Professor of Anthropology; Sir Arthur S. Eddington, Professor of Astronomy; Professor S. Alexander, dean of British philosophers; Rev. C. W. O'Hara, Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy. The theologians are Canon Streeter; Dean Inge; Dr. W. E. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham; Dick Sheppard, who was the popular rector of St. Martin-in-the-Field; and Dr. Jacks, editor of *The Hibbard Journal*. It would be difficult to assemble twelve more conspicuous leaders of science and religion.

The memory of the bitter words, often uttered with more heat than light, which passed between the representatives of modern science and the defenders of religion is still with us. In various localities in this country it is still possible to hear ignorant diatribes against science and also to hear very fluent and groundless presentations of theories of evolution and modern psychology. Bigotry and credulity are not the undivided portion of either theologians or scientists. It is necessary to warn theological students that they have not been called to sneer at the results of patient, sacrificial research in the material universe. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal but spiritual. On the other hand, true scientists have to repudiate much which is published in the name of science. Denials of spiritual truths are made which the facts of science do not warrant. It is because of these things that the conflict has been embittered. This book does much to reveal this cause of conflict, but Professor Pupin, in

his Foreword, touches a most significant fact: "It is indeed a most encouraging sign that the best of English science is not indifferent to England's religious thought, and that some of the foremost among the English ecclesiastics are not indifferent to the trend of thought of modern science."

It should be considered an advantage to have assembled in so small a volume the tenets of such men concerning science and religion. When all of that is said, however, these very addresses make it quite evident that, for whatever reason, the chasm between scientists and theologians is very wide and very deep. The representatives of both find it difficult to keep within their proper spheres. May we not hope that such symposiums as this, conducted in a friendly spirit, will contribute toward uniting science and religion in the defense and propagation of the truth? There is enough undisputed territory, and there is a great need of thorough knowledge. There should be a united effort to combat error, ignorance, and superstition. The reader will best arrive at an understanding of what these talks are about by considering a few isolated quotations. For example, Professor S. Alexander makes this claim:

"Now what I want to say is that the object of religion is the completion of the one and the same world of things of which physical nature is another part, and consequently that religion has no call modestly to urge that spirit and God count for something in the world, but rather that a scientifically-minded person needs to recognise religion in order to have a satisfactory view of the world" (p. 132).

If there is to be a discussion at all, this is a primary proposition. The scientist with his open-minded claim that he deals with facts must include the great fact of religion.

Sir Arthur Eddington is impressed by man himself as related to the universe. "To realise the insignificance of our race amid the majesty of the universe is probably healthful. But it brings to us a more alarming thought. For Man is the typical custodian of certain qualities or illusions which make a great difference to the significance of things. He displays purpose in an

inorganic world of chance. He *can* represent truth, righteousness, sacrifice. In him there flickers for a few brief years a spark from the divine spirit. Are these as insignificant as he is?" (P. 118.) And he adds: "The first question asked about facts or theories such as I have been describing is 'Are they true?'. I want to emphasize that even more significant than the astronomical results themselves is the fact that this question about them so urgently arises. The question 'Is it true?' changes the complexion of the world of experience—not because it is asked *about* the world but because it is asked *in* the world. If we go right back to the beginning the first thing we must recognise in the world is something intent on truth—something to which it matters intensely that belief should be true." (P. 119.)

Man himself who asks, Is it true? is a fact which must be accounted for by those who hold "that our bodies are pieces of stellar matter which by a contingency not sufficiently guarded against have taken advantage of the low temperature to assume unusual complication and perform the series of strange antics we call life." Over against this Julian Huxley says:

"There is, in fact, only one world-stuff, only one flow of energy. And since man and life are part of this world-stuff, the properties of consciousness or something of the same nature as consciousness must be attributes of the world-stuff, too, unless we are to drop any belief in continuity and uniformity in nature. The physicists and the chemists and the physiologists do not deal with these mind-like properties, for the simple reason that they have not so far discovered any method of detecting or measuring them directly. But the logic of evolution forces us to believe that they are there, even if in lowly form, throughout the universe. Finally, this universe which science depicts works uniformly and regularly. A particular kind of matter in a particular set of circumstances will always behave in the same way; things work as they do, not because of inherent principles of perfection, not because they are guided from without, but because they happen to be so made that they cannot work in any other way." (P. 15.)

That seems to mean that he is so far committed to continuity and uniformity in nature that there is no place left for anything

but the naturalistic religion. Such a conception closes all doors to a doctrine of grace. If there is any salvation it is of ourselves. "Our minds, in fact, like our bodies, are devices for helping us to get along somehow in the struggle for existence. We are entrapped in our own natures. Only by deliberate effort, and not always then, shall we be able to use our minds as instruments for attaining unvarnished truth, for practising disinterested virtue, for achieving true sincerity and purity of heart." (P. 17.)

His hope for religion is that it will assimilate truth of this kind as it has assimilated the discoveries of Kepler, Galileo, and Newton and is now slowly assimilating evolution. Of science he says: "Science, like art, or morality, or religion, is simply one way of handling the chaos of experience which is the only immediate reality we know" (p. 17). This he adds, however, which is well worthy of meditation: "But science has two inherent limitations. First, it is incomplete, or perhaps I had better say partial, just because it only concerns itself with intellectual handling and objective control. And secondly, it is morally and emotionally neutral. It sets out to describe, and to understand, not to appraise nor to assign values. Indeed, science is without a scale of values: the only value which it recognises is that of truth and knowledge." (P. 18.)

Bronislaw Malinowski, who is an anthropologist and who was brought up under Roman Catholic influences, makes this confession: "Personally, I am an agnostic. I am not able, that is, to deny the existence of God: nor would I be inclined to do so, still less to maintain that such a belief is not necessary. I also fervently hope that there is a survival after death, and I deeply desire to obtain some certainty on this matter. But with all that I am unable to accept any positive religion—Christian or otherwise. I cannot positively believe in Providence in any sense of the word, and I have no conviction of personal immortality." (P. 77.) In spite of this state of faith he presents a wonderfully clear conception of the function of religion.

Canon Streeter makes a valuable distinction: "It appears, then, that it is of the essence of consciousness, not merely to

apprehend, but to apprehend *qualitatively*. Now the effort of science is, so far as possible—it is never completely possible—to get rid of the qualitative element in apprehension. So far as possible, science only deals with what can be measured; and so far as possible it deals with this by means of mathematical equations which express measurement.” (P. 100.) And here is a fine appraisal of religion: “The saying ‘God is love’ is a statement of quality. The aim of religion is to make people apprehend something about the quality of the power behind the Universe—Its mystery or awe, Its ‘friendliness’ or Its beauty—as this quality has been experienced by the great souls of the race. And religion can do this, I suggest, because to certain of the great souls of our race there has come into consciousness, more richly and fully than with ordinary men, the inner quality of that universal life in which we all participate—‘in which we live and move and have our being’. The Infinite Life of the Universe—in so far as that life indwells in the race of man—finds in religion an expression of Its own inherent quality; and It does this most clearly in the consciousness of the men with special genius for religion, whom we name the great prophets of our race.” (P. 102 f.)

These quotations give a taste of the quality and nature of this excellent volume. The views expressed are divergent, and very frequently the reader cannot agree with them. After reading all of them there is a conscious conviction that the heart of the matter is not there. The cross does not figure, and there is scant presentation of the great Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The theologians show too much readiness to assimilate the new and too little urge to glorify the realities of the inner life. It might prejudice the reader to call these men the twelve apostles of Modernism, yet that is just about what they are. At the same time, so small a volume containing so much and presenting so concisely the points of view of Modernism is invaluable.

Having said all this we come back to our first proposition, that Christianity has a vital sufficiency to assimilate all truths, and that which is not true will be rejected.

JAMES PALMER.

THE DISCOVERY OF GOD⁴

THE AUTHOR of this book, which came off the press January 19 last, is Professor Emeritus of Systematic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary of Pittsburgh. He also teaches Philosophy of Religion as well as Psychology of Religion, and in the teaching of these disciplines he has few equals and not many superiors. He has the unusual gift of simplifying the profound.

The book is scholarly, like every other book which has come from the author's pen. The arguments are clear, concise, and to the point. Unlike the productions of many present day writers, whose object seems to be the hiding of wisdom in a multitude of words, Dr. Snowden goes to the heart of his subject without the circumlocution which is such a weariness to the flesh, hardly repaying the time and study spent in endeavoring to discover the thought hid in the accumulation of words. The author, while discussing the greatest mysteries in physics and metaphysics, which have always occupied the thoughts of the keenest minds, uses the plainest English in such simple, clear, and terse manner that the reader, if he has had any training in the subject, will have his mind enlightened while reading the words.

The book contains eleven chapters which are divided under headings and subheadings. Dr. Snowden seeks to add to the sum of human knowledge concerning God without detracting from the knowledge which we already possess. He says that "the spirit of exploration does not seek to destroy the old lands and shores from which it sets out on a voyage of discovery, and in the search for new truth we can no more discard the old than the tree can sever itself from its roots and still live. Yet conservatism must be wedded to progress, otherwise it may constrict us and keep us out of many a promised land."

Chapters 2 and 3 are devoted to the goal and the means of discovery. The author lays emphasis on the fact that "the soul itself is the fundamental means of discovery whether it be in the subjective field of the self, or in the objective field of the world.

⁴ *The Discovery of God.* By James H. Snowden. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1932. Pp. xvi+230. Index.

It is the primary means of all knowledge, and is necessarily prior to any knowledge that can come to it from without. Personality is the most penetrating and powerful key to unlock and explore the universe," and what the universe has to reveal concerning God.

In chapter 4, *The Outcome of Science*, the author says:

"The outcome of this study is that science has rebuilt the apparent confusion of the world into a vast altar and temple of ideas that bear witness to God and lead us up to His worship. Science instead of sinking the human mind in the materialism of the world, has rather transmuted the material world into a mental structure, and unless it takes more mind to construe the universe than to construct it, it must ever confront us as an infinite mind appealing to our finite minds, the sublime challenge of thought to thought." (P. 44.)

There is a tendency in the scientific mind now to believe that the creation is the materialization of the thought of the Creator. Sir James Jeans says, "Today there is a wide measure of agreement, which on the physical side of Science approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading towards a non-mechanical reality; the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine."

In the Epistle to the Romans the Apostle declares that nature teaches a knowledge of God, and that man has a capacity for receiving this teaching. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God manifested it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived by the things that are made." Thus the outward creation is not the parent, but the interpreter, of our faith in God. This faith has its primary source in our own breast, but it becomes an intelligible and an articulate conviction only through what we observe around. Thus the inner and outer revelations of God, which are the complement of each other, make up between them one universal and immovable conviction that God is. Nature is our great teacher, and the more we study her secrets the more we attain to the knowledge of ourselves, of the material world, and of God. As man surveys the universe he is constrained to admit that the order and beauty which prevail have not come into being spontaneously, but are the productions

of some intelligent Being, and that there is a creative power now at work sustaining the universe which has been brought into existence. The author declares that nature is a book that is intelligible, and can be read by intelligence, and the conclusion is that it is the expression of mind. (See p. 68.)

In chapter 5, *The Discovery of God Through Philosophy*, Dr. Snowden gives a clear and simple statement of the idealistic position. On page 71 he states: "The soul is reality in itself, and consists in its three-fold nature of thought sensibility and will, and the world matches the soul in all these points and manifests itself as consisting of the same nature. The soul of man is a little world, and the world is a great soul." Concerning mechanism, materialism, and pantheism, Dr. Snowden will have none of them, as experience has shown them to be subversive of morals. With the above we compare this from Berkeley:

"I have no notion of any action distinct from volition. Neither can I conceive volition to be anywhere but in a spirit, therefore, when I speak of an active being, I am obliged to mean a spirit. I assert as well as you, that since we are affected from without, we must allow powers to be without in a being distinct from ourselves. From the effects I see produced, I conclude there are actions, and because actions volitions, and because there are volitions there must be a will. The things that I perceive must have an existence out of my mind, but being ideas they cannot exist otherwise than in an understanding. There is therefore an understanding. But will and understanding constitute in the strictest sense a Spirit."

And as the author states, "This Spirit is God."

In his discussion of mysticism Dr. Snowden makes a distinction between Christian mysticism, which he declares to be sober, rational, and efficient in the practical life, and the class of experiences based on pathological conditions which seem to be a favorite study of the psychologists. Mysticism which consists in an immediate awareness of God, even as we are aware of our own thoughts and feelings, is like religion itself, wider than Christian experience, but there is an ocean of difference between that of Paul and that of H. G. Wells. All those who have come to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus have had the same

experience as Paul and can say with him, "I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me."

It seems to us that the word "discovery" gives a one-sided view of the quest for, and finding of, God. If God is an objective reality as well as a subjective idea, then revelation might be a better word. The Scriptures say that God spoke to Moses face to face as a man speaks to his friend. Did He, or did He not? Again, God appeared to Abraham in the plains of Mamre. Was this a dream? When the Apostle exclaims, "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me," and millions throughout the ages have affirmed that they also have had a similar experience, would not revelation be the better term? Of course, any revelation passing through the human consciousness will emerge as a discovery.

To the prospector in quest of the latest findings of modern science this book will be a rich mine of information. The Christian, whether he be minister or layman, will have his faith in God and the Christian life strengthened and his heart warmed with the conviction that God is, and that nature and Scripture are His revelations of Himself.

DUNCAN MACKENZIE.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF A PRIMITIVE PEOPLE ⁵

THIS BOOK results from a visit to Australia in the year 1929, which was made by Professor Porteus to study the mental status of the Australian aborigines, or Bushmen, as they are more familiarly known. The fascination which these primitive people hold for the anthropologist is due to the fact that they have long been regarded as the most backward people in the world. Isolated from contact with white civilization more completely than any other people, living without any permanent dwelling places, without shelter, and some of them without any clothing, they represent the lowest grade of intelligence and primitive life. They seem to hold in their personalities and social organization

⁵ *The Psychology of a Primitive People: A Study of the Australian Aborigine.* By Stanley D. Porteus, Professor of Clinical Psychology in the University of Hawaii. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1931. Pp. xvi+438. Index. Illustrations. Maps.

the key to much desired knowledge concerning the most primitive people.

One wonders why such a rich field of anthropological, sociological, and psychological raw material, right in the heart of a great continent where Anglo-Saxons have lived for centuries and have a high degree of civilization and university life, should wait for an outsider from the Hawaiian Islands to come to their land to make this study. The truth is that the Australian whites have not waited for anyone. They have been busy for years studying these Bushmen, and much valuable material is already in print dealing with the subject. Of this Professor Porteus has made very generous and appreciative use. In addition to this scientific material there is also a large quantity of fiction and poetry inspired by these primitive people. *The Little Black Princess, We of the Never-Never*, by Mrs. Aeneas Gunn; *The Lure of the Desert* and *The Desert Dreamers*, by Kathlyn Rhodes; *Bush Ballads and Galloping Rhymes*, by Adam Lindsay Gordon; and poems by E. J. Brady and other Australian poets give one the imaginative background for a study of a more scientific nature. So Professor Porteus is not entering a virgin field, but one in which much work has already been done.

His reason for undertaking this work was that, in 1928, the Australian National Research Council invited him to visit Australia and carry out a series of investigations of the mental status of the aborigines of that continent. So that he is not an intruder, but a well known specialist whose skill and reputation in this special line of work earned him this invitation. Anyone at all familiar with modern intelligence tests is well acquainted with Professor Porteus' *Maze*, his many published reports of clinical work, and his books. Having done special work among the Japanese, Chinese, Hawaiians, and other races, he seemed best qualified to carry on this work.

The reviewer is interested in this work by Professor Porteus for three reasons. First, because, during the summer of 1929, he was in the Hawaiian Islands, where, although he did not meet Professor Porteus who was at that time in Australia, he did become very well acquainted with one of his clinical assistants and

so learned much of his work in Hawaii, and also what he was doing in Australia. Second, for years we have been deeply interested in Australia through literary friends who are native Australians and who have kept us in touch with the literature in this field. And third, because we are much interested in the psychology of primitive people, especially the Australian aborigines, concerning whom we have been gleaning all the information possible for years.

This work looks large and forbidding, but it is very readable, and has only a part of its pages devoted to technical mental tests and their classifications. It contains maps of the vast geographical territory over which Professor Porteus was compelled to travel to visit the tribes in the north, central, and southwest parts of the continent. It also contains many photographs of the native Bushmen in their customary dress or undress and in their decorated ceremonial costumes, so that one comes to feel acquainted with their appearance. The author also gives for the layman photographs of the mental test apparatus which he used.

The book is divided into two parts. Part I is entitled *Aboriginal Environment* and contains nine chapters, in which we find such alluring titles as, *The Mission in the Pindan*, *Aboriginal Religion and Magic*, *Stone Age Workmen and Their Ways*, *Desert Dwellers*, *Luritcha Dances and Ceremonies*. In this division of the book Professor Porteus gives a very graphic description of the aboriginal environment by taking us with him as he journeys over the vast desert stretches of country from one tribe to another. The drought conditions which five years without a drop of rain have produced in that tropical desert country are hard to realize, but they furnish the elemental environmental problems for many of these tribes. Without a knowledge of physical conditions one can never understand the physiological and psychological forces influencing the development and adjustment of these primitive people to the elemental problem of living.

Professor Porteus seemed to have a way of winning the confidence of these people so that they admitted him into their inner

circle and he was privileged to be present at some of their most secret dances, initiations, and ceremonies. All of this makes interesting material, some of it coming to the public for the first time.

The second part of the book is entitled *Aboriginal Intelligence*. This deals with the more technical material for which he made his visit. It contains chapters XII-XXIII, a few of whose titles will reveal some of the subjects treated: *Environmental Handicaps, Primitive Beliefs and Customs, Origin and Dispersion, Socially Unifying Expedients, Psychology of Initiation, Aboriginal Mental Attributes, Examination Methods*. The remaining chapters deal with technical mental tests and their findings.

I think one paragraph very well sums up his general conclusions:

"If there is one thing which to my mind emerges most definitely and unmistakably from this study it is the selective influence of environment and the apparent malleability of human nature. But this malleability is not mobility. No one knows the numbers of generations that must have been subjected to the Central Australian environment before the distinctive traits of its people have been formed. The malleability of human nature is that of cold iron, but environmental influences are like the thousand blows of a sledge hammer beating the metal out into its distinctive forms. Nor can I, considering the evidence at hand, do otherwise than believe that the basic metal is intrinsically variable, so that some is more easily moulded, and is beaten more easily into new forms. In short, to those who affirm racial equality I would present the facts of the present study which seem to show in so many points that mental differences associated with race are real and significant. But though admitting these differences I would hesitate to describe any race as unintelligent. Even a so-called primitive race such as the Australians may be excellently adapted to their own environment and therefore must be deemed intelligent. But at the same time they are certainly unadaptable to a civilized environment." (Pp. 374 and 376.)

There are a number of points in this study which are of great significance to the student of psychology of religion. One of the most important is the claim which Professor Porteus makes

all through his investigations, that the aboriginal Australians are an intelligent people, the central tribes being found by test to be of the highest mentality on a number of different lines. These primitive people are also highly disciplined, have unusual self-control, and bear pain without flinching. The young men especially are under perpetual restraint by the authority of the old men, and there is no sign of rebellion.

One field which has received no study as yet is that of the religious life of these people. Having no civilization through which this life can come to recognizable form, it is concluded that they come no nearer religion than magic. But one psychologically sensitive and keenly alert to religious consciousness inherent in the human being, senses its emotional, intellectual, and volitional forces clearly at work even at this level. Some day this study will be made and these facts revealed.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

MARY BAKER EDDY⁶

EDWIN F. DAKIN's book, *Mrs. Eddy. The Biography of a Virginal Mind*, drew all of the defensive Christian Science batteries into immediate action. The public is already familiar with the daring attempts to intimidate reviewing papers and periodicals, the forcing of department stores and book stores to withdraw the sale of this book under pressure of threatened boycott, and the resort to every form of usual Christian Science defensive tactics. But it is not so generally known that there was also a new literary offensive begun, the counter publication of series of articles and books widely heralded as coming from the pens of better informed and fairer minded authors who were eager to acquaint the public with the "real Mrs. Eddy."

The first few series of articles and books which appeared in this literary offensive were not by authors of sufficient prominence; they did not measure up to requirements. The reading public was not quite sure of their disinterested purpose. So the

⁶ *Mary Baker Eddy. A Life Size Portrait.* By Lyman Powell. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. xiv + 364. Index. Notes. Illustrations.

problem seemed to be to find someone not a Christian Scientist, but known to be clearly identified with another church, to come to the rescue and in the true spirit of ancient chivalry write an authorized life of Mrs. Eddy that would be irresistible. This is an old method of the Christian Science Church. When Georgine Milmine's *Life of Mrs. Eddy* appeared and made such a stir, they secured Sibyl Wilbur to write what at its first appearance was widely proclaimed to be a work by one outside the Church; but after a few years the book became the *authorized* life of Mrs. Eddy. It seemed necessary to repeat this defensive movement again after the publication of Dakin's book. So here we have the new life of Mary Baker Eddy, by Lyman P. Powell, a clergyman in good standing in the Protestant Episcopal Church, who feels it his duty to come to the rescue of the "real Mrs. Eddy." Dr. Powell is a writer of some standing, an ex-college president, a lifelong student of Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science. He wrote a book on Christian Science in the early years of this century. How he came to qualify for this work with the Christian Science Church in Boston is told by him in this very interesting passage:

"When the resurgence of critical interest in Christian Science came a year ago, the author was invited, at a New York luncheon table, to speak out his opinion of the situation. His reply to the friends who made the request, one of whom had been editor of the Christian Science periodicals and was himself the writer of several books, was an outright declaration that the time had come for the spokesmen of Christian Science effectively and finally to lift discussion out of the lowlands of controversy, to the heights of general understanding. To one he observed:

"'You ought to write a book based on the hitherto unused materials which your church must have, and for all time lay some of the smaller bothers and misapprehensions which every little while reappear. The climate has changed. The public is weary of controversy. Christian Scientists have done too many fine things to be disturbed so often by vexatious disputation. Bring it to an end the only way you can.'" (P. 16 f.)

Following this "speaking out" of his opinion on this subject, the author, "almost chapter by chapter blocked out the book he thought the times required." Following this luncheon, several

conferences were held with the Board of Directors of the Boston Church, which resulted in the decision that Dr. Powell was the man to write the book he had outlined. The fact that he was a clergyman in good standing in the Episcopal Church was one of his most valued qualifications. His willingness to co-operate so heartily with the Board of Directors of the Mother Church, and his amazingly sympathetic appreciation of Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science were the deciding points. The Board of Directors were to give him all the assistance within their power to use the "hitherto unused materials" in their possession to bring to an end the "misapprehensions which every little while appear." And in addition to this some eight thousand documents and letters left by Mrs. Eddy were to be made free to him for his use. And, in all of this use of these precious documents and this cordial support by the Board of Directors, he was to be "financially and intellectually untrammelled." So the work was undertaken which has given us the book under review.

It is not necessary to spend much time in reviewing the book as a whole. For, after the Prologue and the first chapter, it falls into the typical, stock, authorized Christian Science material, and does not contain a single new feature that is of any significance. The Prologue and the first chapter, however, furnish the new problem of the book, and that is the problem of how a clergyman in good standing in the Protestant Episcopal Church and as intelligent and conscientious as Dr. Powell could bring himself to perform this service for the Board of Directors of the Christian Science Church.

The first chapter runs through forty pages of typically extravagant testimony in praise of Mrs. Eddy and Christian Science. We give these examples:

"I never knew the meaning of real happiness until I became a Christian Scientist'" (p. 31).

"Every day they live, Christian Scientists are indebted to Mrs. Eddy. Through her writings their whole outlook on life and experience of life has been changed. She has enabled them to find convincing proof of the truth of Christianity as taught by Christ Jesus, and has shown them how it may be applied and lived to-day.'" (P. 32.)

“Christian Science is the Christian religion pure and simple, a religion of works, a nearer approach to the ministering religion that Jesus taught and practised in the accomplishment of his mission to the world than men have known for seventeen hundred years’ ” (p. 38).

“Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy is one of the great benefactors of mankind. She has given to the world one of the great religions. She has interpreted the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth in a manner to prove a blessing to many hundreds of thousands of souls. . . . She has perhaps done more to fulfill the words of the Great Master, Himself, than any individual of recent centuries.’ ” (P. 39 f.)

And so on for forty large pages. There is nothing new in them. They are the familiar stock testimonials that have become the substance of Wednesday evening meetings and press publications. How a clergyman of an evangelical church can bring himself to the interweaving of these fulsome testimonials with paragraph after paragraph of approval without becoming a Christian Scientist is a psychological and ethical problem which the reviewer finds it hard to solve. For, if he believes as he writes, he belongs within the Christian Science fold.

From the beginning of the second chapter, entitled *A Rich Girlhood*, to the last word of the last chapter, *By Their Fruits*, as has been said, there is nothing but old, stock, stereotyped, authorized material. Of course, it was obvious that, if the Board of Directors did have in their possession any material that they could use to advantage to throw new light upon the “real Mrs. Eddy,” they would not have waited for an outsider to come and tell them of its value. What it is hard for the reviewer to understand is how a man like Dr. Powell could be inveigled into writing a life of Mrs. Eddy that would meet the hearty approval of the Christian Science Church. To one like the reviewer, who knows this material from beginning to end, it is a puzzle to understand how Dr. Powell could so conscientiously select the material he uses—and leave out so much that was at his disposal. He certainly knew that his picture of Mrs. Eddy’s “*Rich Girlhood*” was an idealization that he could not produce documents to substantiate. And that picture of Mr. Eddy! Could it be possible

that he believed he was painting an honest portrait of the real Mr. Eddy? And that story of Mr. James Henry Wiggin's literary assistance to Mrs. Eddy! Anyone who knows the various editions of *Science and Health* from the time that Mr. Wiggin came to assist her until the time he was dismissed could not dispose of his activity with such treatment. If the reader would like a little more information upon that subject it will be found in my own book, *The Non-Sense of Christian Science*, where I deal with this subject somewhat fully. And so one might go through the whole book now under notice. Dr. Powell gives us stock material. And anyone who knows the Board of Directors of the Mother Church knows that they would not have given him access to material in their possession and friendly support to this project without knowing before they established this relationship what the author was going to do when he made use of it. No criticism of Mrs. Eddy is allowed, and not even their lecturers are trusted to deliver lectures save those that the Board of Directors has already approved. Dr. Powell may not have been trammelled financially or intellectually; but the book itself is proof of the fact that the Board of Directors made no mistake when they chose Dr. Powell to write this book for them. He has not betrayed their trust in him.

Nor has he accomplished the great objective of putting an end for all time to the other portrait of "the real Mrs. Eddy." The documentary evidence for that Mrs. Eddy painted by Georgine Milmine, Peabody, and Dakin and that found in my own book and in Calvin Frye's diary revelations of Mrs. Eddy as he knew her (*Harper's Magazine*, Feby., 1931) is all too easily accessible. And we do not know the Mrs. Eddy who founded Christian Science unless we know that Mrs. Eddy. When this book finally becomes the authorized life of Mary Baker Eddy, Dr. Powell will receive his financial reward. For all the faithful will be compelled to own a copy of his book, and all the public libraries will be presented with copies. And this will be reward enough.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

